CIRCUITS OF IMPERIAL CITIZENSHIP:
INDIAN PRINT CULTURE AND THE POLITICS OF RACE, 1890-1914

BY

IRINA SPECTOR-MARKS

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2017

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Antoinette Burton, Chair
Associate Professor Teresa Barnes
Associate Professor James Brennan
Professor Isabel Hofmeyr, University of Witswatersand
Associate Professor Dana Rabin

Abstract

At the turn of the twentieth century, Indian immigrants throughout the British empire faced a rise in discriminatory legislation. They responded by asserting that as imperial citizens, Indians should be treated equally with white British subjects. Although imperial citizenship had no fixed legal meaning, Indian activists invoked imperial citizenship as a legal status *and* as an identity that carried racial and civilizational overtones. Through a close reading of iterations of imperial citizenship across a wide range of print culture sources, I show how imperial citizenship, although ostensibly race-blind, was an implicitly racialized discourse. Based on research from archives in Ottawa, Vancouver, Durban, Pietermaritzburg, Pretoria, and London, I map how the discourse of imperial citizenship circulated across the empire in a transnational print sphere of periodicals, pamphlets, and petitions. By focusing on the work of activists in Canada and South Africa, I explore the ways in which local political and racial contexts precluded the potential for material forms of transnational collaboration. My dissertation nuances the "transnational turn" in the humanities by emphasizing the role of local factors in shaping larger global politics. By analyzing both the discourse of imperial citizenship and the material production and dissemination of that discourse, this dissertation argues that diasporic Indians navigated the global color line by aspiring to whiteness in the name of an imperial citizenship that was founded on racial discrimination while purporting to stand for equality and justice. By bringing together scholarship on citizenship, empire, immigration, and whiteness, my research reveals the complex and contradictory development of anti-racist politics in the early twentieth century.

For dad

And I'm the only son of a gun who's left to tell the tale

Acknowledgements

It is a truism amongst academics that all dissertation is autobiography. As a white woman from the United States, I was often asked why I was studying Indian immigrants in the British empire. While I had many reasons for choosing this topic, the personal stakes of the project were driven home to me as I sat on my bed in Durban on June 26, 2013. I had stayed home from the archives in order to have internet access as I waited on tenterhooks for the Supreme Court's decision on the constitutionality of the Defense of Marriage Act. With DOMA overturned, I booked a flight to St. Paul where my partner was staying with her family. We were married on August 10 and filed for her green card on August 12, just weeks before her student visa was due to expire. I then returned to the archives in Pretoria to finish out my research year investigating immigrant activists and the ways they had combated discrimination. This research has been a labor of love, for the topic and the political and intellectual problems it poses, but also for all those individuals, known and unknown, who have struggled to choose a home for themselves in the face of governmental prejudice.

It has not been a labor I have completed alone, however. In these pages, I wish to thank those who have supported my work. I am particularly lucky to have many individuals in my life who have done both intellectual and emotional labor to help me through this process.

The History Department at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign provided an intellectual home throughout my years in the PhD program. Antoinette Burton has known with unerring accuracy when to challenge and when to nurture. Her impact on my intellectual coming-of-age has been immense and invaluable. I am incredibly grateful to have her as a mentor and a friend. Dana Rabin shared her knowledge of British history alongside advice as to how to survive as an East Coast Jew in Urbana, Illinois. I treasure her insights, hugs, and humor.

Terri Barnes has supported and critiqued this project since its earliest incarnation in my first-year paper. She also valiantly agreed to mentor my global history prelim and was a key interlocutor as I conceptualized the role of Africa in global history. Jim Brennan introduced me to the history of the Indian Ocean littoral and is always ready with a book recommendation (or three!). From the first time we met, Isabel Hofmeyr has graciously given her time and thought to this project, opening her home in Johannesburg to me and carrying on a trans-Atlantic conversation about the vagaries of early twentieth century periodicals. My first-year cohort gave me a set of life-long comrades who supported me through and beyond our graduate program, including Zach Sell, Scott Harrison, Milos Jovanovic, and Emily Pope-Obeda. T. J. Tallie gave me wonderful guidance, not only as my first-year mentor at Illinois, but also in providing a myriad of introductions for me in South Africa. Rachel Heeter Smith filled long car rides to Baltimore and almost equally long skype sessions from London with her enthusiasm for history and the wider world.

Institutional support from the University of Illinois and other institutions made this project possible. The Graduate College Illinois Distinguished Fellowship launched me in graduate school and subsequent fellowships from the history department allowed me to travel to South Africa, Canada, and Britain to complete extensive archival research. The Doris G. Quinn Foundation Fellowship gave me time to complete the writing of the dissertation. Teaching undergraduates at the University of Illinois in Global History, Western Civilization, and British History courses helped me articulate important points at key moments during the ideation of the project. There really is nothing like teaching to clarify one's thoughts and I am grateful to the professors, fellow TAs, and students with whom I worked, especially Antoinette Burton,

Behrooz Ghamari-Tabrizi, Elizabeth Quick and Zsuzsa Madgo. The staff in the history department at Illinois, especialy Shannon Croft, walked me through every step of the process.

Research overseas can be an exhausting and alienating experience and I am grateful to everyone who helped to make temporary homes in Ottawa, Vancouver, Durban, Pietermaritzburg, Pretoria, and London. Mr. Chetty at the Gandhi Luthuli Documentation Centre generously allowed me to take material over to the Killie Campbell Africana Library when the lightbulb on his microfilm reader broke on my first day there. Likewise, Senzo Mkhize at Killie Campbell allowed to me to hog his microfilm machine for weeks on end while I worked through *Colonial Indian News* and *African Chronicle*. Goolam Vahed helped me to acquire an affiliation with the University of KwaZulu-Natal, shared with me his digital copies of *Indian Opinion* (a real life-saver), and introduced me to UKZN's history department colloquia. Kilpana Hiralal, Julie Parle, and others at UKZN discussed my research and gave me pointers and encouragement. Renisa Mawani gave me an opportunity to come back to British Columbia by inviting me to the Charting Imperial Itineraries conference, where the organizers and contributors had an amazing weekend of conversations and collaboration that led to the edited collection *Charting Imperial Itineraries*, edited by Renisa, Satwinder Bains, Davina Bhandar, and Rita Kaur Damoon. Others gave me a literal home while I was travelling. Cailin Hedderwick kept me sane (or, barring that, at least shared insanity with me) and became a lifelong friend during the few short months we had together in Durban. Her mother, Fiona Hedderwick, let me stay at her house during my two weeks in Pietermaritzburg—above and beyond the call of duty! Tim Ames and Barbara Wright took in and put up their long-lost niece during her time in Vancouver.

I have an amazing family, of both the biological and the chosen variety. The extended Landman-Baylin-Spector clan has watched my intellectual career with loving encouragement and always made a place at the table for me when I could pull my head out of a book. Mary, Leon, Sophie, and Rhea didn't make it to grad school with me but they imbued me from a young age with a sense of pride in my scholastic achievements. Amanda Spector has stuck by me through thick and thin, in spite of my perennial refusal to answer the phone. Herman Bennett and Jennifer Morgan nurtured my love of history from an age when it was expressed through dolls and tea parties rather then historiographical debates. Derek Attig has been my confidant and my hero throughout the later years of grad school. He's been immensely patient with all my questions as I navigated the ins and outs of the dissertation process. More importantly, he's shown me how to find the life that makes me happy, rather than the one that I thought ought to make me happy. Ashley Hetrick and I knew we were kindred spirits approximately ten minutes after the first time we talked. Derek and Ashley also fed (literally and figuratively) me and Eszter when we couldn't feed ourselves. Christine Ruggere and I have been to hell and back together. From bibliographic queries to *A Child's Christmas in Wales*, she's been there for me when I needed her most. I learned this trade at my father's knee, tagging along to lectures, conferences, and research trips. If it is my father who taught me how to *do* history, it is my mother who taught me how to love it. Telling me about "olden times" from before I was verbal, she made history come alive by making it about people and the stories they tell. Eszter Sápi came az óperenciás tengeren is túl and thank god for it! She has done truly Herculean labors with this dissertation: editing, proofreading, and listening to all my early morning and late night rants about it. More importantly, she is my person, as I am hers.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Circuits of Imperial Citizenship, 1890-1914

In 1906, the lawyer Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi represented a Portuguese Indian named Suliman Manga who applied for a visa to pass through the Transvaal on his way from England to his home in Portuguese Mozambique. Gandhi's first application, which listed Manga as a British subject, was denied; while his second, in which Manga was correctly identified as a Portuguese subject, was allowed.[1] As the Transvaal correspondent for Gandhi's newspaper *Indian Opinion* pointedly observed: "When is an Indian not an Indian?...When he is a Portuguese subject…Mr. Manga, a Portuguese subject, has won; Mr. Manga, a British subject, has been disgraced."[2] Highlighting both the racial indeterminacy of the designation "Indian" and the political contradiction that non-British subjects were treated better than British subjects, *Indian Opinion* argued that such differential immigration policies were un-British and un-imperial. Even the *Rand Daily Mail*, which was staunchly anti-Indian, thought it strange that Manga was denied as a "subject of the British Empire" while permitted as "a citizen of Portugal."[3] This case, following on the heels of an incident in which a Japanese merchant, Mr. Nomura, was allowed entry to the Transvaal after protests by the Japanese government, exemplified Indian activists' worst fears: that as British subjects they were worse off than as subjects of another empire or nation.[4]

[1] "The Transvaal Permit Ordinance," *Indian Opinion*, 14 April 1906.
[2] "Johannesburg Jottings: (By our Transvaal Representative): When is an Indian Not an Indian? When he is a Portuguese Subject," *IO*, 14 April 1906, 223.
[3] *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in "The Manga Case: 'Official Ineptitude,'" *IO*, 21 April 1906.
[4] "Statement Regarding British Indians in the Transvaal and the ORC," 18 April 1906, enclosed in Dadabhai Naoroji to the Secretary of State for India [henceforth SSI], 8 May 1906, The National Archives of the United Kingdom [henceforth TNA] Colonial Office [henceforth CO] 291/108, Transvaal No. 18691; "The Nomura Case," *IO*, 9 December 1905. *The Rand Daily Mail*, as well as British M.P.s, worried what the effects would be in India if the results of the Manga case were known there (*Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in "The Manga Case: 'Official Ineptitude,'" *IO*, 21 April 1906; Sir Henry Cotton, quoted in "Imperial Parliament: House of Commons: British Indian Grievances," *IO*, 16 June 1906).

I begin with this episode for three reasons. My dissertation examines how the articulation of Indian imperial citizenship was shaped by circulation with a transnational, diasporic, and imperial activist print culture. The Manga case illuminates the shifting and indefinite parameters of race, nationality, and immigration at the turn of the twentieth century. Diasporic Indians responded to white settler attempts at exclusion with the insistence that as imperial citizenship, they had inalienable rights. This episode allows us to see imperial citizenship for what it was: a legally imprecise descriptor that did not exist in statutes but was nonetheless incredibly potent. Imperial citizenship was, at the height of its power, not a well-defined or enforced political status, but a discursive category used by highly mobile subjects in creative and flexible ways. Second, the incident heralds a central contention of the dissertation, namely, that Indian invocations of imperial citizenship emerged out of the print culture formed at the intersection between governmental and legal activity and print-based political activism. In this case, Gandhi took his failure to his client (what kind of immigration lawyer neglects to determine the nationality of his client?) and transformed it into a transnational media spectacle denouncing the myth of imperial justice and shaming the British, Indian, and Transvaal governments.[5] Thirdly, this episode brings home the human cost of debates over immigration restriction. While historians have done a masterful job mapping the transnational and imperial legal, governmental, and intellectual circulation of immigration restriction at the turn of the twentieth century, their birds-eye view has, of necessity, obscured the experiences of immigrants themselves. Although this dissertation, too, focuses on the discourses of imperial citizenship, self-government, and

[5] In addition to mistaking Manga's nationality, Gandhi also stated that Manga was going to visit his father (or perhaps uncle), when in fact he was going to visit a cousin. However, the Transvaal British Indian Association (led by Gandhi) insisted that these details were irrelevant to the application (Transvaal British Indian Association [TBIA] to Lord Selborne, quoted in "Transvaal Permits: Wives to Carry Permits," *IO*, 12 May 1906). *Indian Opinion* and the TBIA redirected questions about the Manga case to emphasize Gandhi's position as a representative of the Indian community and reframed the issue as a political, rather than legal, tangle in order to put pressure on the imperial and colonial state.

racial supremacy surrounding the immigration debate, I want to pause to remember the men and women like Suliman Manga who wanted to visit their uncles, cousins, siblings, to live with their wives and children, to trade in the port of their choice, or to explore unknown places and who were prevented by the cruel caprices of imperial and national law. Debates over the meaning of imperial citizenship did not happen in some rarefied discursive field; rather, the discourse of imperial citizenship, for all its vagaries and contradictions, *mattered* in a very real and immediate way.

At the turn of the twentieth century, anti-Asian prejudice led to waves of immigration restriction legislation in the white settler colonies of the British empire. This legislation was of particular concern when it targeted Indians, who as British subjects, felt that they had a right to unrestricted migration within the empire. This dissertation tracks the complex and contradictory invocation of imperial citizenship by Indian activists in South Africa and Canada from 1890 to 1914 as they challenged the empire's practices of racial discrimination. Through close reading of diasporic Indian print culture, I explore how local and transnational forces shaped debates over political and racial belonging. I argue that conditions in British Columbia and Natal precluded the possibility of material political solidarity between Indians in those colonies even as an imperial print sphere encouraged an ostensibly shared discourse of imperial citizenship.

The fin-de-siècle moment was a crucible for the interaction and escalation of many historical changes. This period saw increased and new forms of imperialism and racism. It was also a time of increased mobility of both people and information, through new technologies such as the passenger steamship, telegraph, and telephone. With increased literacy and ever-cheaper methods of printing, popular and political publishing blossomed. These technologies of communication and mobility created new possibilities for transnational political activism, while

also heightening awareness of political tensions in disparate locations. All of these global (and globalizing) trends impacted the political and cultural landscape of diasporic Indian activists.

The popular history of diasporic Indians in the pre-war era, like that of Indian nationalism more generally, is dominated by the figure of Gandhi.[6] The canonical story of Gandhi in South Africa is that of an Anglicized loyalist who discovered his Indianness when he is tossed off the train in Pietermaritzburg.[7] This dissertation is bracketed almost exactly by the years that Gandhi was in South Africa, 1893-1914. Yet one of the goals of the dissertation is to de-exceptionalize Gandhi by putting him in context as only one of many diasporic activists in this period navigating imperial racial hierarchies by invoking imperial citizenship. When one traces the discursive circuits of imperial citizenship, other figures and voices emerge, from the Ghadarite socialist Husain Rahim in Vancouver to Durban-based printer and activist Panchapikisa Subramania Aiyar. For Rahim, the invocation of imperial citizenship was instrumental in garnering white settler support for immigration reform, while Aiyar used imperial citizenship to create a political identity and belonging for those Indians who were born in South Africa but nonetheless felt a connection to the subcontinent, the so-called "colonial-born Indians." These other voices provide a cacophony that resolves itself into a remarkably unified political demand for imperial citizenship when one zooms out across space and time, only to dissolve again into distinctive accents and particularities as one focuses on local political and racial contexts. Through close reading of ten periodicals from five countries, as well as other publications and material from government archives, this dissertation examines the dense and entangled forces

[6] Some recent works include: Ashwin Desai and Goolam Vahed, *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016); Ramachandra Guha, *Gandhi Before India* (New York: Vintage Books, 2015); Isabel Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press: Experiments in Slow Reading* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013); Leela Gandhi, *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), chapter four; Sugata Bose, *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), chapter five.
[7] This iconic image has been popularized by Richard Attenborough's 1982 film *Gandhi*.

that made Indian imperial citizenship such a universal and yet highly variegated transnational discourse in this moment of racial empire.

This dissertation focuses on people and places at the margin of empire. Centered neither on London nor the metropoles of the Indian Empire, Calcutta and Delhi, this work analyzes political action at the periphery. In particular, it analyzes these peripheral places' relationship with *each other*, as Indian activists negotiated transnational politics operating from the distant places of the empire. London was an important site of transnational organizing, but it appears here as one location amongst many. Protests against immigration restriction emerged from the liminal spaces of empire, from Durban and Vancouver rather than London or Delhi. This dissertation moves beyond the binary of metropole-periphery in order to analyze peripheries in relation to each other.[8] This approach reveals a vibrant political print culture that, despite operating from the margins of empire, nonetheless moved political action at imperial centers. Diasporic activists like Aiyar or Rahim, ostensibly peripheral to imperial politics and virtually unknown within empire history, created a political maelstrom in Britain in which questions in Parliament asked if immigration restriction was destroying the fabric of the empire.

Diaspora, imperial citizenship and Indian nationalism

Although the history of Indian nationalism has often been focused on the subcontinent, diaspora and the development of Indian nationalism were intertwined,. Only in recent years have historians of diaspora, migration, and empire articulated this relationship explicitly. However,

[8] The idea of seeing metropole and periphery as intimately connected to each other, even overlapping in the same space, is explored in Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California, 1997); Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2002). For scholars who call for exploring colonies in relation to each other, in addition to studying colonies' relationship to the metropole, see:
Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002); Antoinette Burton, "Imperial Optics: Empire Histories, Interpretive Methods," in *Empire in Question: Reading, Writing, and Teaching British Imperialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), esp. pgs. 12-15. More recently, scholars have called for work that explores colonies in relation to each other, in addtion to studying only colonies' relationship to the metropole.

many of the elite political leaders on which historiography of Indian nationalism focuses (Surendranath Banerjee, Dadabhai Naoroji, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Mohandas Gandhi, Subhas Chandra Bose) travelled, lived, or thought at key moments in their careers beyond the borders of the subcontinent. Thus, much of the literature on the nationalist movement in India is inherently also a history of Indian nationalism beyond the subcontinent.[9] Even before transnationalism, diaspora, or global history became academic buzzwords, the historiography of Indian nationalism reflected ways in which the Indian nationalist project was constructed by movement within, through, and outside of the subcontinent.[10] This recognition has been made increasingly explicit by scholars who theorize the effect of migration or diaspora on Indian nationalist thinkers. Peter van der Veer's contention that "Those who do not think of themselves as Indians before migration become Indians in the diaspora" frames much of the current scholarship on diaspora, which takes as a central premise that nationalist identity and thought was often crystallized in the experience of moving outside of the subcontinent.[11] Other scholars start with

[9] This is perhaps slightly less true of the subaltern school, since they were interested in recuperating a history of Indian nationalism beyond the more mobile elites. However, Clare Anderson's work has shown that subalterns, whether 1857 rebels or racially ambiguous "Jim Crow" performers, were also incredibly mobile actors who played a key role in the formation of racial, national, and political identities (Clare Anderson, *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[10] Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*, 2nd edition (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986, 1993) is perhaps the most explicit engagement with this concept. However, any history that discusses the formation of the Indian National Congress or the biographical details of many Indian nationalist leaders must acknowledge the interaction with England that shaped political thought and action in an imperial age.

[11] Peter van der Veer, "Introduction," in *Nation and Migration: The Politics of Space in the South Asian Diaspora*, Peter van der Veer, ed. (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995), 7. See also: Rajesh Rai and Peter Reeves, "Introduction," in *The South Asian Diaspora: Transnational networks and changing identities*, Rajesh Rai and Peter Reeves, ed. (London: Routledge, 2009). Other scholarship on the topic argues that the "homeland" or "nation" imagined in diaspora is often regional, linguistic, religious, or local, rather than national, or that multiple imaginings co-existed for migrants forming identities for themselves in response to political developments both in the subcontinent and in their new home. See for instance: Susan Koshy and R. Radhakrishnan, eds., *Transnational South Asians: The Making of a Neo-Diaspora* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2008); Tony Ballantyne, *Between Colonialism and Diaspora: Sikh Cultural Formations in an Imperial World* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Sana Aiyar, "Anticolonial Homelands Across the Indian Ocean; Politics of the Indian Diaspora in Kenya, ca. 1930-1950," *American Historical Review* 116, no. 4 (1022): 987-1013; Maia Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia: How the Ghadr Movement Charted Global Radicalism and Attempted to Overthrow the British Empire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, Ltd., 2011).

key Indian nationalist figures and examine how the experience of moving beyond India (most often to Britain, but also within the Indian or Pacific Oceans) affected their articulation of Indian identity and the parameters of the nation.[12] At its best, such work aims to complicate the very concept of nation by entangling the emergence of the idea of a geographically bounded, eternally unchanging ahistorical nation with the historicized movement of individuals and ideas. In doing so, this work makes clear that the idea of the Indian nation is embedded within and generated out of forms of mobility that implicitly challenged the central principles of the nation.

Even within this literature, however, it is still difficult to find histories of diasporic nationalism that attend to the ways in which the dual concepts of national and imperial citizenship overlapped with and reinforced each other. Opposition to immigration exclusion, in particular, was founded on assertions of imperial loyalty and belonging to the empire which were simultaneous with and inextricable from defenses of Indian national honor and calls for recognition of India as nation-state. While recognizing the importance of Indian nationalism within the subcontinent and of the historiography on that nationalism, this dissertation focuses instead on how diasporic Indians, positioned between multiple homelands and governments, used nationalism in concert with imperial citizenship. Both as heartfelt identity and as strategic ploy, diasporic subjects needed to be able to negotiate multiple, interacting citizenships.[13] For

[12] Bose, *Hundred Horizons;* Javed Majeed, *Autobiography, Travel and Postnational Identity: Gandhi, Nehru and Iqbal* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007); Sumita Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities: The England-returned* (London: Routledge, 2010); Sumita Mukherjee and Rehana Ahmed, eds. *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947* (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2012).

[13] Claude Markovits points out that diasporic merchants used both Indian nationalism and imperial citizenship strategically in order to achieve their goals of free mobility. His work reminds scholars that diaspora does not necessarily generate nationalism; rather, migrants responded to the social, economic, and political contexts of diaspora in which they found themselves (Claude Markovits, *Global World of Indian Merchants, 1750-1947: Traders of Sind from Bukhara to Panama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000). Imperial citizenship was certainly strategic for some nationalists, such as members of the radical Ghadr Party who espoused imperial citizenship in their English-language publications and violent overthrow of the British Raj in their vernacular publications. For others like Gandhi, however, the existence of British imperial citizenship seems to have been both a deeply held belief and a useful tool with which to combat settler discrimination. I am less concerned with why imperial citizenship was used than *how* different people invoked it. By exploring the nuances of rhetoric of imperial

this reason, I suspect that the relationship between nationalism and imperial citizenship was more entangled and longer-lived in diaspora than in the subcontinent; however, further research is needed to determine if this distinction holds true.

Throughout this dissertation, I use the phrase "Indian activists" rather than "nationalists" or "anti-colonialists" to describe political actors who advocated for greater rights and opposed white settler supremacy. I choose the term activists because both nationalist and anti-colonialist valorize certain aspects of these actors' political beliefs while obscuring others. These activists, particularly those in diaspora, while they may have advocated greater rights of self-government or even independence for India, were not simply concerned with the creation of Indian nationalism or nation-state, as their use of imperial citizenship demonstrates. Therefore, to call them nationalists seems to me to privilege the eventual outcome of Indian independence above other political projects, such as resistance to white settler racism, which they saw as equal and intertwined projects.[14] At the same time, the term anticolonial cannot, I would argue, be properly applied to activists like Gandhi or Aiyar, who supported the British empire and were active participants in settler colonialism.[15] Their anticolonialism was at best highly selective, often criticizing anti-Indian actions on the part of white colonists while endorsing colonial or imperial projects against other disenfranchised groups. These activists selectively espoused both nationalist and anticolonial beliefs. Indian nationalism, in particular, was a key part of their

---

citizenship, I am able to trace both local and transnational shifts in meaning and tone, which were far more contingent on local and even individual momentary political strategies than previously recognized.

[14] Both Seema Sohi and Maia Ramnath have articulated this point in their distinction between subcontinental "nationalists" and Ghadr "anticolonialists" (Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 8; Seema Sohi, "Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anticolonialism in the Transnational Western U.S.-Canadian Borderlands," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011), 423, fn. 8).

[15] The question of whether or not Asian immigrants can be considered settler colonists is a hotly contested one within the academic community. I agree that it is inaccurate to collapse Asian immigrants with white settlers or to ignore the power differential between the two groups. Nonetheless, particularly in Africa, South Asian immigrants often colluded in and benefited from the disenfranchisement and expropriation of black Africans. See chapter three for a more detailed discussion of the historiography of this question.

political worldview. Nonetheless, in order to accurately depict the multiplicity of their politics, I have chosen the term activists as the most appropriate representation of the contingent and complex politics which they articulated.

Central to this politics, as will be shown throughout the dissertation, was the assertion of imperial citizenship, alongside and interacting with other forms of political belonging such as Indian nationalism. The phrase "imperial citizenship" had its heyday in the politics of the late-nineteenth century British empire. Before the 1850s, the term "British subject" was used exclusively; whereas, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, both British subject and imperial citizen were used, often interchangeably. Although there are clear commonalities between invocations of "British subject" by colonists in the eighteenth century and "imperial citizen" in later years, the term "imperial citizen" itself does not appear before the 1850s. The mid-century Don Pacifico affair highlighted the question of imperial citizenship. A naturalized British subject from Gibraltar, Jewish merchant Don Pacifico was attacked by Greek nationalists, and in 1850 the Foreign Minister Lord Palmerston argued that Britain must retaliate against Greece for this attack on a British subject. In his speech, Palmerston referenced the classical "civis Romanus sum" ("I am a Roman citizen"), a claim which guaranteed protection to citizens throughout the Roman empire. Re-imagined as "civis Britannicus sum," this phrase appropriated for Britain the power and grandeur of the Roman empire.[16]

"Imperial citizen" began appearing regularly in political discourse in the 1880s. The concept was central to debates about colonial self-government, imperial organization, and colonial subjects' rights that rose to prominence around the turn of the twentieth century. Daniel

[16] Daniel Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006), 14; Mrinalini Sinha, "The Strange Death of an Imperial Ideal: The Case of *Civis Britannicus*," in *Modern Makeovers: Handbook of Modernity in South Asia*, ed. Saurabh Dube (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). See chapter two for a further discussion of these phrases.

Gorman's intellectual history of imperial citizenship focuses on the years between 1895 and 1920, while Sukanya Banerjee's recent monograph analyzes works from 1861 to 1936.[17] It was during this period that politicians and intellectuals, including Richard Jebb and Alfred Milner, began intentionally conceptualizing the relationship between Britain and the settler colonies. It was also during this period that Indian nationalists began calling for greater rights of self-government within the subcontinent. As self-governing colonies moved to implement immigration restriction in order to re-create themselves as "white man's countries," imperial citizenship became a hotly contested concept. White settlers imagined imperial citizenship as the inheritance of "Greater Britain," an implicitly racial as well as political category. However, the mythos of the British empire held that imperial citizenship was open to all regardless of race, caste, or creed.[18] As I will show, Indian activists in the subcontinent and beyond embraced the language of imperial citizenship as a crucial rhetoric with which to claim political belonging. This concept was particularly important to Indian immigrants who were determined to challenge white settler exclusion. Imperial citizenship offered them a discourse through which to claim governmental protection, assert participation in the imperial project, and challenge white supremacy through alternative racial, social, and political hierarchies.

All histories of British imperial citizenship must begin with the recognition that there was no such legal category. Not only were there no laws denoting who an imperial citizen was or what rights that citizenship carried, there was also no British citizenship until 1981. The British

[17] Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*; Sukanya Banerjee, *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in the Late-Victorian Empire* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010).
[18] Mohandas Gandhi, "A Farewell Letter," in *Documents Relating to the Indian Question*, ed. C. F. Andrews (Cape Town: Cape Times Limited, n.d.), 22; Joseph Chamberlain, quoted in petition from the Indians of Natal, 18 September 1897 (Durban), MS IND, Killie Campbell Africana Library; Khalsa Diwan Society (Vancouver) to Viceroy of India, 9 January 1913, in *Proof 5277 Published India Office papers*, Library and Archives Canada [henceforth LAC], Immigration Branch [IB], RG 76, Volume 384, File 536999, Part 9. See also Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 5, 146.

Nationality and Subjects Act of 1914 recognized a common British subjecthood across the empire, while allowing the Dominions to create their own immigration and naturalization laws. The British Nationalities Act of 1948 created five categories of citizen/subject within the British empire, including British subject, British Protected Persons, and Citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies. Prior to 1914, however, only "British subject" was defined in law.[19] Nonetheless, imperial citizenship existed as a potent political discourse amongst a wide range of speakers at the turn of the twentieth century. Legal historian of British citizenship Reiko Karatani has asked "Why did it take the British government [until 1981] to institute British citizenship by legislation?"[20] My dissertation responds to this question by asking a different one: how did Indians in diaspora use this lacuna in the law to their advantage in asserting an imperial citizenship that was not a legally recognized category?

Throughout the dissertation, I use "imperial citizenship" to refer not to a legal status, but to denote the *idea* of a political identity configured around Britishness, belonging, and mobility. This dissertation offers a discursive, rather than a legal or material, history of imperial citizenship as it was used by diasporic Indian activists. The terms "imperial citizenship" and "imperial citizen" (as well as "British citizen") appear explicitly quite often in the primary sources. This, in spite of the fact that, legally speaking, Indians, as well as white settlers and many Britons themselves, were British subjects rather than citizens. Traditionally, subject status is defined as an exchange of loyalty to a monarch in return for protection, where citizenship is defined by the franchise and guarantees equality between citizens.[21] However, Indian activists

[19] Reiko Karatani, *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003), 1, 28-30, 149; Keith McClelland and Sonya O. Rose, "Citizenship and empire, 1867–1928," in *At home with the empire*, eds. Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 278.
[20] Karatani, *Defining*, 2.
[21] McClelland and Rose, "Citizenship and Empire," 278; Anne Spry Rush and Charles V. Reed, "Imperial Citizenship in a British World," in *Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies*, ed. Engin F. Isin and Peter Nyers (London: Routledge, 2014), 498.

(and many of their British and colonial contemporaries) used the terms "subject" and "citizen" interchangeably, ignoring these legal distinctions between subject and citizen.[22] This conflation allowed them to claim rights based on traditional aspects of subjecthood, such as loyalty to the monarch, and at the same time to assert an inclusive and equal citizenship centered around rights such as voting or immigration. As Banerjee points out, paying attention to the language of citizenship rather than its legality illuminates something that histories of colonial state would argue was impossible—Indian imperial citizens.[23] Daniel Gorman argues that citizenship in the late nineteenth century "combined such political discourse with a broader social identity of 'Britishness."[24] The intellectuals and politicians that Gorman studies were concerned with creating a legal definition that would express and create a shared diasporic British social and political identity. Although the Indian activists I am writing about aspired to certain legal rights (franchise, immigration, domicile) associated with citizenship, they were not *primarily* interested in creating a single legal category of imperial citizenship.[25] Instead, they referred to imperial citizenship as an already existing legal status in order to imagine and evoke forms of racial, social, and political belonging.

The parameters of this identity and the rights that it conveyed were constantly being debated and re-imagined, but some themes recurred regularly. The assertion of imperial citizenship carried connotations of Britishness, expressing racialized and gendered belonging through behaviors including military service, loyalism, education, dress, and language. The political rights that imperial citizenship carried were incredibly mutable and hotly contested.

---

[22] See chapter two for a fuller discussion of the subject/citizen distinction.
[23] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 5.
[24] Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*, 9-10.
[25] Their interest in legal definitions of citizenship tended to be reactive, as in the responses to the British Nationalities and Status of Aliens Act of 1914 ("Notes and News," *India*, 22 May 1914; "The Naturalisation Bill," *IO*, 22 April l914; "News in Brief," *IO*, 17 June 1914.

Nonetheless, Indian activists used imperial citizenship to defend a wide range of rights: immigration, domicile, franchise, and the rights to settle, trade, and travel without being impeded by racial restrictions. Two qualities were central to Indian activists' iteration of imperial citizenship: it applied regardless of race or national origin and it allowed freedom of migration throughout the empire. This dissertation focuses on the negotiations that occurred around these two components of imperial citizenship as Indian activists confronted a white settler ideal of imperial citizenship premised on racial exclusion.

Belief in an imperial citizenship that applied regardless of race or national origin was crucial to diasporic Indians caught among the governments of their colony of domicile, India, and Britain.[26] I investigate how and why Indian subjects were so successful in asserting imperial citizenship as a viable political status despite the fact that it was not an actual, legal status. Even those who disagreed with Indian activists' definition of the rights associated with imperial citizenship acknowledged that they had the right to claim such a status. How did imperial citizenship come to be the dominant discourse amongst Indian nationalists, British imperialists, and colonial settlers alike?

I contend that imperial citizenship was such a powerful discourse precisely because it was not enshrined in law, yet was believed to be integral to the British imperial state. As a discursive category, it therefore had both incredible potency and flexibility. It might be applied to anyone and could include any number of rights. As a result, many unlikely allies could agree that Indians deserved imperial citizenship, and organize around that issue, without ever

[26] "The proposed appeal to Lord Curzon," *Colonial Indian News* [henceforth *CIN*], 17 January 1902. For flexible citizenship as a response to the political and legal strictures of diaspora, see: Sukanya Banerjee, "Empire, the Indian Diaspora and the Place of the Universal," *Diaspora* 15, no. 1 (2006): esp. 149; Ballantyne, *Between Colonialism and Diaspora*, esp. chapter two; Enseng Ho, "Empire Through Diasporic Eyes: A View from the Other Boat," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 210-246; Parvati Raghuram and Ajaya Kumar Sahoo, "Thinking 'Indian Diaspora' for Our Times," in *Tracing an Indian Diaspora: contexts, memoires, representations*, eds. Parvati Raghuram, Ajaya Kumar Sahoo, Brij Maharaj, and Dave Sangha (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008), esp. 5; Aiyar, "Anti-colonial Homelands," esp. 987-989.

needing to specify what precisely that meant. Proponents of Indian imperial citizenship ranged from the radical nationalist Lala Lajpat Rai to the staunch Conservative Lord Ampthill. Although its advocates had very different definitions and intentions behind their embrace of imperial citizenship, the ubiquity and force of that category must be recognized even as we analyze its internal contradictions and fractures.

Diasporic Indian activists negotiated complicated racial hierarchies as they debated legal, political, and cultural forms of belonging in relation to the British empire, the Indian nation, and the white settler colonies. Indian immigrants confronted the borders of the supposedly universal figure of Britishness/whiteness and, in laying claim to that figure via imperial citizenship, simultaneously destabilized and reinforced it. In doing so, they revealed even as they utilized the violently exclusionary and hierarchical nature of British liberal universalism.

Immigration restriction and whiteness: entangled histories

Within the British empire, immigration restriction was a particularly fraught issue, since the imperial government would not allow racial bans to be written explicitly into law. Anti-Asian legislation was increasingly popular with white settler colonists from the late nineteenth century, just as these colonies gained more autonomy from imperial oversight. Caught between the rhetoric of equal imperial citizens and the demographic reality of racial discrimination, the British government struggled to placate the self-governing colonies without alienating Indian subjects.[27] Contemporaries on both sides of the debate believed that this conflict had the potential to destroy the empire.[28]

[27] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; Margaret Allen, "'Innocents abroad' and 'prohibited immigrants': Australians in India and Indians in Australia 1890-1910," in *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, eds. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005); Robert Gregory, *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations within the British Empire, 1890-1939* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 127-130; Robert A.

Immigration restriction was a fundamentally transnational project, as settler colonies in the Anglophone world sought to control racialized regimes of migration and labor.[29] Actively recruiting some forms of laboring bodies, colonial governments also sought to restrict the mobility of other laborers. For instance, in Canada, the government recruited immigrants who would farm, preferring Americans and Europeans from rural areas, including Britain, Scandinavia and Germany immigrants. However, "laborers," meaning factory workers and urban dwellers, were not wanted.[30] In Natal, plantation and railroad interests encouraged the recruitment of indentured laborers from India and China, while other settlers tried to prevent non-European immigration entirely.[31] Complex and contingent calculations of capital, labor, gender, and race influenced opinions about desirable and undesirable populations, which changed across space and time.

Huttenback, "The British Empire as a 'White Man's Country'—Racial Attitudes and Immigration Legislation in the Colonies of White Settlement," *The Journal of British Studies* 13, no. 1 (November 1973): esp. 110-7; Robert A. Huttenback, *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-governing Colonies, 1830-1910* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), esp. chapters three and four; Adam McKeown, *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008); B. Pachai, *The International Aspects of the South African Indian Question 1860-1971* (Cape Town: C. Struik (Pty) Ltd., 1971), 9-15, 35, 63-80; Hugh Tinker, *Separate and Unequal: India and the Indians in the British Commonwealth 1920-1950* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1976), esp. chapter one; A. T. Yarwood, "The Overseas Indian as a Problem in Indian and Imperial Politics at the End of World War One," *The Australian Journal of Politics and History* 14, no. 2 (August 1968): 204-218.

[28] "All is Over: What is Next?," *African Chronicle* [henceforth *AC*], 22 August 1908; Hassan Dawad, "Flag of Injustice," *IO*, 10 October 1908, quoted in *AC*, 17 October 1908; petition to Joseph Chamberlain from Indians in Natal, 27 March 1897, Gandhi Luthuli Documentation Centre [henceforth GLDC] HIST 1906/1914.

[29] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; McKeown, *Melancholy Order*; Vilna Bashi, "Globalized anti-blackness: Trasnationalizing Western immigration law, policy, and practice," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27, no. 4 (July 2004): 584-606; Kornel Chang, "Enforcing Transnational White Solidarity: Asian Migration and the Formation of the U.S. – Canadian Boundary," *American Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 2008): 671-696; Sohi, "Race, Surveillance," 425; Jeremy Martens, "A Transnational History of Immigration Restriction: Natal and New South Wales, 1896-7," *Journal of Imperial and Colonial History* 34, no. 3 (September 2006): 323-44.

[30] Laura Detre, "Canada's Campaign for Immigrants and the Images in *Canada West* Magazine," *Great Plains Quarterly* 24 (Spring 2004): 113-29; Gurcharn S. Basran and B. Singh Bolaria, *The Sikhs in Canada: Migration, Race, Class, and Gender* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003), 100; Minister of the Interior to Governor General (Canada), 7 May 1908, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Part 3.

[31] Duncan Du Bois, "The 'coolie curse': The evolution of white colonial attitudes towards the Indian question, 1860-1900," *Historia*, 57, no. 2 (September 2012): 31-67. As early as 1887, the Wragg Commission Report stated that Indians were welcome in Natal as laborers, but not as settlers, a sentiment that was enshrined in the 1895 Immigration Law Amendment Act (Gregory, *India and East Africa*, 127).

Colonists and administrators shared ideas across national and colonial boundaries on how to best enshrine racial restriction in law in coded language.[32] Although these debates spread across the British empire, South Africa and Canada were crucial sites of the development—and the contestation—of anti-Indian laws. Natal's Indian Immigration Amendment Act of 1895 imposed a £3 tax on all ex-indentured laborers, in the hopes of compelling them either to re-indenture or to return to India. [33] In 1896, Natal attempted to bar "coloured races" from immigrating, regardless of whether they were British subjects. The Colonial Office disallowed this law, while simultaneously asking the Indian Government to restrict immigration to South Africa.[34] The following year, Natal adopted a language test from the US Immigration Restriction Act of 1896.[35] This became known as the "Natal formula," which was adopted by several other colonies.[36] In 1913, two court cases, the Justice Searle decision and the Khulsum Bibi case, severely restricted the immigration rights of Indian wives.[37] By the 1920s, not only had Indian immigration to South Africa slowed to a trickle, the South African government also tried to promote a "repatriation" scheme to return South African Indians to the subcontinent.[38] In Canada, different modes of exclusion were practiced, including requiring $200 from all Asian

[32] McKeown, *Melancholy Order*; Allen, "'Innocents abroad'"; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*; C. Kondapi, *Indians Overseas, 1838-1949* (New Delhi: Indian Council of World Affairs, 1951); Tinker, *Separate and Unequal,* esp. chapter one; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; Chang, "Enforcing"; Sohi, "Race," 425.
[33] Gregory, *India and East Africa*, 127.
[34] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 125-8.
[35] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 62-4, 129.
[36] McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, 192-98; Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*, 193; Huttenback, "White Man's Country," 111-2; Pachai, *International Aspects*, 38.
[37] Pachai, *International Aspects*, 61.
[38] S. A. Waiz, *Indians Abroad*, 2nd ed. (Bombay: Indian Daily Mail Press, 1927), 249.
The Colonial Born and Settlers' Indian Association Manifesto, [1933?] GLDC HIST/O/CBSIA GENERAL; *Interim Statement submitted to the Deputation appointed by the Government of India by the SAIC reflecting the present condition of the Indian community in Natal and the Transvaal, in terms of the communication made by the Government of India*, 21st November [192?] GLDC HIST/O/SAIC 1920s; Shamil Jeppie, "Re-classifications: Coloured, Malay, Muslim," in *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place: New Perspectives on Coloured Identities in Cape Town*, Zimitri Erasmus, ed. (Colorado Springs: International Academic Publishers Ltd., 2001), 83-4.

passengers and using spurious medical diagnoses to restrict Indian immigrants.[39] A 1913 Order in Council that barred laborers was directed primarily against Asian immigrants.[40] In 1908, British Columbia passed an Order-in-Council which required immigrants to come "by a continuous journey from the country of emigration and on a single boat with through-ticket therefrom." This legislation was later re-affirmed in the 1910 and 1914 Immigration Act.[41] Since no steamboats operated through-trips between India and Canada at the time, this served to completely halt Indian immigration. Between deportations, voluntary emigration, and an almost total ban on Indian immigration after 1914, the Indian population of Canada had decreased to 1016 by 1921.[42]

Similar laws aimed to disenfranchise or otherwise inconvenience Indians who lived in South Africa and Canada. These laws restricted where Indians could live, their travel, and their trade. In British Columbia, Asians, including Indians, could not vote from 1895 onwards.[43] When Natal tried to ban all Indians from the franchise in 1895, the law was disallowed by the British government. In response, a year later, Natal limited the franchise to those who had a vote in their home country, thus effectively disenfranchising Indians.[44] A number of laws in the Transvaal from 1895 to 1910 progressively restricted the rights of domiciled Indians to trade, settle, own property, build homes, and move freely in cities. Law 3 of 1885, commonly known as the Black Act, barred Indians from the vote, restricted their homes and business to segregated neighborhoods.[45] The Transvaal's Asiatic Law Amendment Ordinance of 1906 required all Asians to be fingerprinted and to carry registration certificates which they would produce on

[39] Huttenback, "White Man's Country," 136; Hugh Johnston, *The East Indians in Canada* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1984), 7; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 28-9.
[40] Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 100.
[41] Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*, 207; Huttenback, "White Man's Country," 136; Johnston, *East Indians*, 7.
[42] Johnston, *East Indians*, 9.
[43] Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 87.
[44] Pachai, *International Aspects*, 10-11.
[45] Pachai, *International Aspects*, 14-15.

demand on pain of deportation.[46] Other laws banned Indians from taking cabs reserved for white passengers or from walking on city sidewalks.[47] Many of these laws were expanded in 1910 under South African Union to apply beyond individual provinces to the entire country. The cumulative effect of these laws was to make living and working in South Africa and Canada increasingly difficult for domiciled Indians.

Early historians of this movement such as Robert Huttenback and Robert Gregory focused on the imperial government's response to colonial government's racial legislation and Indian activism. They showed how colonial governments, in collaboration with imperial officials in Britain, developed a series of ingenious forms of implicit exclusion.[48] These historians, as well as more recent scholars, argue that racial legislation that sought to limit Indian mobility was a crucial factor in the self-governing colonies' call for increased independence. National unity and independence was expressed in racial terms and through the mechanism of racial legislation.[49] Later historians, inspired by the cultural and transnational turns in history, have looked beyond governmental sources to track the transnational circulation of racial discourse and legislative strategies between Britain and settler colonies.[50] This work has demonstrated how white settlers' restrictions on Asian mobility and creation of national borders was enabled by the transnational mobility of white settler texts, legislation, and personnel.

---

[46] Pachai, *International Aspects*, 33.
[47] These laws were particularly vexatious to wealthy Indians because they made no distinction between lower-class and upper-class Indians, and classed all Indians together with Africans. See chapter three.
[48] Gregory, *India and East Africa*; Huttenback, "White Man's Country"; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*; Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*, 193; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 37-8; Pachai, *International Aspects*; Yarwood, "Overseas Indian."
[49] Allen, "'Innocents abroad,'" 113; Leigh Boucher, "'Whiteness,' Geopolitical Reconfiguration, and the Settler Empire in Nineteenth-Century Victorian Politics," in *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, eds. Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 46, 54-6; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, esp. 4-7, 11; McKeown, *Melancholy Order*.
[50] Bashi, "Globalized anti-blackness"; Chang, "Enforcing"; Sohi, "Race"; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; McKeown, *Melancholy Order*; Boucher, "Geopolitical Reconfiguration"; Martens, "Transnational History"; Allen, "'Innocents abroad,'" 114.

Our understanding of the relationship between immigration restriction and imperial citizenship is greatly enriched by the insights of whiteness studies. Scholars like Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds have been instrumental in making visible the connection between whiteness and settler colonialism, as they historicize both whiteness and immigration restriction as the construct of a particular moment of transnational racial discourse. Such scholarship has vastly enriched our understanding of the relationship between nation, empire, and race. Whiteness studies, which emerged out of a US context of explaining anti-black racism, has since spread to British empire history and specifically has been embraced by historians of the settler colonies.[51] These scholars approach whiteness as a social construct rather than a monolithic entity, and examine how groups such as the Irish, Jews, Italians, or even English settlers were not always considered white.[52] Eighteenth and nineteenth century racial configurations were always shifting and the whiteness of various immigrant groups remained contingent on the political geographies they encountered.[53]

However, these historians' focus on white settler sources has obscured the complex relationship between imperial citizenship and whiteness. Whiteness studies has focused primarily on Europeans, ignoring or rejecting Indian claims to whiteness or Britishness.[54] Radhika

---

[51] Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus, *Re-Orienting Whiteness* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), esp. introduction. For a more in-depth historiographical review of whiteness studies, see chapter three.

[52] David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991, 2007); Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Colour: European immigrants and the alchemy of race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (London: Routledge, 1995).

[53] Radhika Mohanram, *Imperial White: Race, Diaspora, and the British Empire* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Satoshi Mizutani, *The Meaning of White: Race, Class, and the 'Domiciled Community' in British India 1858-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (New York: Basic Books, 2003); Kathleen Wilson, *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire, and Gender in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Routledge, 2003), esp. chapter two; Cecily Jones, *Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina, 1627-1865* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

[54] An important exception to this is Susan Koshy's work on the difference between South Asian racial politics in the US and Britain, which analyzes historical and contemporary claims to whiteness by South Asians in the US (Susan Koshy, "South Asians and the Complex Interstices of Whiteness: Negotiating Public Sentiment in the United States

Mohanram, who masterfully explores the ways in which colonial whiteness was troubled and contested on grounds of gender, sexuality, and distance from the metropole, nonetheless accepts that the Indian man's "visible difference would prevent him from ever being conferred with a liberal subjectivity. He was a British man who could never be realized."[55] Similarly most histories of imperial citizenship only include white settlers and Britons.[56] Gorman argues that in citizenship debates "non-whites were marginalized because they were perceived as extraneous to debates about national and imperial identity which valued British values and character."[57] Even Sukanya Banerjee, whose *Becoming Imperial Citizens* is the first monograph to extensively analyze Indian claims to imperial citizenship, argues that Indians were always "becoming" imperial citizens but never reached that status.[58] In these interpretations, whiteness and imperial citizenship exist as the limit of Indian inclusion in the empire. This dissertation unsettles that assumption by examining in depth Indian claims to both imperial citizenship and whiteness. Contrary to Banerjee's assertion, Indians did not believe that they were "becoming" imperial citizens. They believed that they *were* imperial citizens and that white settlers were depriving them of already existing rights. I agree with Banerjee that Indians' claim to universal citizenship took the form of "negotiations with the implicit whiteness of universality and its attendant dynamic of racialized exclusion."[59] But, I argue that rather than simply arguing for a race-blind citizenship, Indian activists used imperial citizenship as a way of claiming whiteness because

---

and Britain," in *White Women in Racialized Spaces: Imaginative Transformation and Ethical Action in Literature*, ed. Samina Najmi and Rajini Srikanth (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 29-50).

[55] Mohanram, *Imperial White*, 12.

[56] Recent exceptions to this include Sukanya Banerjee's seminal work *Becoming Imperial Citizens*, as well as Sinha, "Strange Death"; Charles V. Reed, "Respectable Subjects of the Queen: The Royal Tour of 1901 and Imperial Citizenship in South Africa," in *Britishness, Identity and Citizenship: The View from Abroad*, eds. Catherine McGlynn, Andrew Mycock and James W. McAuley (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011), 11-30; Rush and Reed, "Imperial Citizenship in a British World."

[57] Daniel Gorman, "Wider and Wider Still?: Racial Politics, Intra-Imperial Immigration and the Absence of an Imperial Citizenship in the British Empire," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 30, no. 3 (Winter 2002): 1-24. See also: Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*, 9-13.

[58] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 5-6.

[59] Banerjee, "Empire," 149.

they understand how key that status was to recognition and equality in a British imperial context. Imperial citizenship was an implicitly racialized term that Indian activists mobilized in order to assert their belonging within an empire built on white supremacy.

A close reading of diasporic Indians' print culture reveals that their defense of an ostensibly racially-blind imperial citizenship was implicitly linked to coded assertions of whiteness. Indian activists responded to racial exclusion with racialized language; emphasizing their own capacity for citizenship on civilizational, cultural, and racial grounds. At the same time, they contested the Britishness, the whiteness, and, therefore, the citizenship claims of Chinese, Africans, and Afrikaner, Jewish, and even British settlers. Proponents of Indian imperial citizenship challenged white settlers' definition of the global color line by asserting racial equality with whites. By divesting whiteness of its association with skin color, these activists simultaneously re-implemented whiteness as a discourse of behavior, civilization, and citizenship. Whiteness, citizenship, and self-government were inextricably intertwined, even for those attempting to critique the global color line.

A transnational exploration of the dynamics of Indian imperial citizenship reveals the shifting parameters of whiteness and imperial citizenship in response to different geo-political contexts. The racial implications of imperial citizenship differed between South Africa and Canada. The socio-economic, regional, and religious make-up of the Indian immigrant populations affected the political and racial connotations that accrued to the transnationally-circulating discourse of imperial citizenship. Although imperial citizenship was a shared discourse that circulated across wide swathes of geographical distance and political difference, local racial and political contexts inevitably shaped the particular nuances of this discourse as it moved across space and time. These racial configurations are dealt with most explicitly in

chapter three but an analysis of the racial connotations of imperial citizenship is imbedded throughout the dissertation.

The existing scholarship misses the diverse challenges to this exclusive definition of imperial citizenship, not only by Indian nationalists, but also by their British and colonial allies. The exclusion of Indians from histories of imperial citizenship takes the eventual triumph of racial legislation as a fait accompli, rather than a hotly contested issue that unsettled imperial dominion for at least thirty years. To do so leads inexorably to the conclusion that the Indian nation-state was the inevitable solution to Anglo-Saxon racist imperialism, thereby reifying current political-geographical and racial boundaries. Recognizing the power of white supremacy to exclude Indians from the material benefits of citizenship, I nonetheless argue for taking seriously Indians' contentions that they were included in imperial citizenship because they were British, espoused British values, and manifested a British heritage. This dissertation explores what "imperial social formations" emerge when one considers Indian imperial citizenship as a politically useful and sincere discourse that was inextricably entangled with settler colonialism and the ever-changing racial lines of the early twentieth century world.[60]

My dissertation brings much-needed attention to the paradoxes and contradictions of Indians' racialized identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century British empire, shedding new light on the relationship between imperial citizenship, whiteness, and self-government by attending to the ways in which Indian activists disputed white settler racism. Through a close reading of periodicals edited by diasporic Indians, supplemented by pamphlets, petitions, and periodicals published in South Africa, Canada, England, and India, I explore the permutations of the discourse of imperial citizenship as it circulated across continents. Reading

[60] Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 2.

these periodicals for their language as well as the material evidence they provide of political organizations, public meetings, activists' correspondence, and fundraising reveals dense networks of transnational activism between different parts of the empire, from Vancouver to San Francisco to Patiala or Durban to London to Madras. Just as white settlers' strategies of racial exclusion circulated transnationally, so did Indian activists' ideas of how to combat such exclusion.

Transnational and comparative history: Why South Africa and Canada?

This project merges comparative and transnational history in order to make visible the full complexities of Indian activism at the turn of the twentieth century. An analysis attuned to transnational connections highlights the multiple connecting strands of what Tony Ballantyne has called the webs of empire.[61] Ballantyne emphasized that there are multiple webs, with different nodes, which layered across and intersected with each other. Many webs influenced the historical subjects examined in this dissertation, including webs of mobile labor (indentured and "free"), webs of governmental reform, and webs of revolutionary anti-colonists, to name just a few. I have focused on the web of print culture activism through which Indian immigrants protested their exclusion from British imperial power. Activists explicitly identified their struggle as a transnational one, calling on supporters throughout and beyond the British empire to support them through political meetings, petitions, and fundraising. In South Africa and Canada in particular, political leaders identified the other colony as a similar *and related* challenge for Indian residents. Thus, historical actors at the time not only engaged in comparisons between the two locations, but identified their struggles as interconnected.

Contemporaries understood the movement of bodies and ideas in relation to immigration as an imperial and even global issue. The INC's mouthpiece *India* echoed a common sentiment

[61] Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race*, 14-6.

when it observed that "it is not the Dutch Afrikanders [sic] alone who would keep all brown men, as well as black men, in a condition of semi-servile subordination. The sentiment is common to Australia, to British Columbia, to California, as well as to South Africa…The whole question is a grave Imperial problem."[62] Each anti-Indian law passed by a colony and permitted by the imperial government provided proof to other colonies and countries that Britain would not oppose anti-Indian legislation.[63] At a time when the passive resistance movement in South Africa was lagging, *African Chronicle* warned, "If we fail in our endeavour to obtain…ordinary rights [of] citizenship in these colonies, we shall not get anywhere else either in the Kings [sic] Dominions or in the territories of Foreign powers."[64] Activists saw their struggles in one colony not as an isolated battle but as part of an imperial, even global, fight against anti-Indian racism. [65] Opponents of immigration restriction understood anti-Indian racism as a menace spreading through transnational networks of print culture and political collaboration. Indian immigrants

---

[62] "Truth Will Out," *India*, 28 November 1913. British observers agreed: *The New Statesman*, quoted in "The Challenge of Asia," *India,* 19 June 1914; Reverend Dr. Wilkie, "Sikhs' Rights in Canada," *Toronto Globe,* quoted in *Aryan,* February 1912; U. de P. Webb, quoted in "Anglo-Indian Legislator: On the Indian Question," *AC,* 26 November 1910.

[63] "Canada and Asiatic Immigration," *AC,* 29 July 1912; "Indians's [sic] position in East Africa," *AC,* 15 March 1913; copy, memorial from Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy, chairman of Bombay Public Meeting, 31 July 1912, to Governor General (India), 1 August 1912, British Library India Office Records [henceforth BL/IOR], L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; "British and Indian Empire League of Australia," *IO*, 22 October 1903; Satish Chandra Banerji, president of United Provinces Congress Committee, quoted in "The Status of Indians Within the Empire," *Canada and India*, July 1915.

[64] "All is Over: What is Next?" *AC,* 22 August 1908. A few weeks later, *African Chronicle* cited news of a new anti-Indian immigration bill in the United States as proof that "what we said a few weeks back has become an accomplished fact," i.e., that through the success of South African anti-Indian legislation, foreign governments were emboldened to undertake anti-Asiatic legislation ("Blatant Imperialism and the Policy of Foreign Powers," *AC*, 29 September 1908, 1). Almost identical language had been used by the *Times* to describe the South African Indian situation in 1896 and again in 1906: "If they secure the position of British subjects in South Africa it would be almost impossible to deny it to them elsewhere. If they fail to secure that position in south Africa it will be difficult for them to attain it elsewhere.'" (*The Times,* quoted in M. K. Gandhi, "Notes on the Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa [typescript]," 22 September 1896, GLDC HIST 1906/1914); *Times* also quoted in petition from Natal Indians to Sec of State for Colonies, enclosed in Gandhi to Sir Walter Francis Hely Hutchinson, Governor of the Colony of Natal, 28/5/96, Pietermaritzburg Archives Repository [henceforth NAB] Colonial Secretary Office [CSO] Minute Papers 1467/1896, Ref 3105/1896.

[65] *India*, quoted in "British Indians in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies," *CIN,* 15 November 1902; Lord Ampthill, quoted in *The Morning Post*, quoted in "Lord Ampthill's Activity," *IO,* 25 April 1908*;* Vox Populi, "Indian National Congress," *AC,* 27 September 1913.

challenged these policies through similarly transnational circuits of protest politics, manifested in periodicals, pamphlets, telegrams, activists, and money.

Imperial citizenship emerged as a seemingly universal discourse which activists in distant parts of the empire and from radically different demographic and political backgrounds could share. The circulation of imperial citizenship, however, did not mean an easy or material solidarity. My research attends to the frictions, gaps, and mistranslations that occurred as transnational discourse circulated through local political and racial terrain. This approach complicates the recent "transnational turn" in the humanities by emphasizing the role of local factors in shaping larger global politics. While transnational history illuminates the connections between disparate locations fostered by determined activists, a comparative analysis enables me to nuance and critique those connections. Although diasporic activists often referenced the political struggles of Indians in other locations as evidence of a shared battle for imperial citizenship, the intention of that discourse varied widely depending on the political and geographical location of different interlocutors. In fact, the transnational response to immigration restriction was characterized as much by factual inaccuracies, missed connections, and purposeful ignorance as it was by the ostensibly "shared" language of imperial citizenship. A comparison of South African and Canada reveals the important differences, as well as the similarities, between these two colonies and their response to Indian immigration. I use these differences to explain why Indian activists in South Africa and Canada ultimately failed to build a robust and enduring transnational political alliance. By combining a comparative and a transnational approach, I am able to analyze in more depth and complexity historical subjects' response to the ever-shifting webs within which they operated. This opens up a history of the

contingent failure of transnational activism, as well as its aspirations, in the fraught fin-de-siècle moment.

At first glance, South Africa and Canada seem like odd choices for a history of Indian imperial citizenship and immigration restriction. South Africa and East Africa or the US and Canada share more demographic similarities, while the Caribbean has a more significant Indian population than Canada. The South-East Africa comparison provides a fundamental backdrop to Robert Gregory's *Indians in East Africa*, and more recent scholars such as Isabel Hofmeyr, James Brennan, and Sana Aiyar have explored these connections in their work on Indian sub-imperialism in the Indian Ocean littoral.[66] There is also a robust scholarship on the connections between Indian activists, particularly Ghadrites, in Canada and the United States.[67] Indeed, many immigrants moved back and forth between the two countries, organizing political activity in response to transnational white supremacy.

While recognizing the commonalities between South Africa and East Africa and between Canada and the US, I contend that the Canada-South Africa axis opens up new perspectives on transnational activism. The constitutional status of South Africa and Canada as self-governing colonies within the British empire created particular political language that did not appear in East Africa or the US.[68] Although Indians in the US defended themselves as British subjects, this argument could not have the same rhetorical or practical force outside the British Empire as it did within it. Indians in South Africa faced the challenge of defending imperial citizenship

[66] Gregory, *India and East Africa*; Sana Aiyar, "Empire, Race and the Indians in Colonial Kenya's contested Public Political Sphere, 1919-1923," *Africa* 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 132-154; Sana Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya: The Politics of Diaspora* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), 4, 46-9, 69; Isabel Hofmeyr, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, "Introduction: Print Cultures, Nationalisms and Publics of the Indian Ocean," *Africa* 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 11-12; James R. Brennan, TAIFA: *Making Nation and Race in Urban Tanzania* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012), 8-9.

[67] For a recent monograph on the transnational Indian activism across the US-Canada border, see Seema Sohi, *Echoes of Mutiny: Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anticolonialism in North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[68] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; Huttenback, "White Man's Country"; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*.

against the argument for self-governing colonies' autonomy, a concern that did not come into play in the East Africa protectorate. South Africa and Canada's status as self-governing colonies made the conflict over immigration restriction into an imperial crisis, one that contemporaries believed could destroy the empire. According to an India Office memo from 1915, "South African conditions differ so widely from those of Canada that there is no close analogy between the two countries. But," it acknowledged, "Indian immigration questions have certain points in common."[69] I have used the commonalities and differences between the two countries as a prism through which to analyze the many valences of imperial citizenship and to reflect on the possibilities and limitations of transnational activism.

Indians first arrived in South Africa in 1860 as indentured laborers. Indentured immigrants were most often brought to Natal where they were employed primarily on sugar plantations, mines, and on the building of railroads. Despite a brief moratorium on indentured emigration from India between 1866 and 1874, by 1911, when indentured immigration to South Africa was finally stopped, 152,184 indentured Indians had entered Natal. By the 1870s, non-indentured Indians, sometimes called passenger Indians, had begun to arrive in Natal and the neighboring province of the Transvaal. Many of these passenger Indians were traders, primarily Gujarati Muslims, who expanded existing Indian Ocean trading networks between India and East Africa.[70]

Indian immigrants first came to Canada sometime between 1895 and 1905. A possibly apocryphal story has it that a regiment of Punjabi Sikhs came over in 1897 as part of Queen

[69] Confidential "India Office Memorandum on Indian Immigration into Canada," 20 August 1915, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1395, File 3277.
[70] Goolam Vahed, "Passengers, Partnerships, and Promissory Notes: Gujarati Traders in Colonial Natal, 1870-1920," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 38, no. 3 (2005): 449-479; Maureen Swan, *Gandhi: The South African Experience* (Johannesburg: Raven Press (Pty) Ltd, 1985), esp. chapter one; Surendra Bhana, *Gandhi's Legacy: The Natal Indian Congress 1894-1994* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1997), esp. 1-5; Surendra Bhana and Joy B. Brain, *Setting Down Roots: Indian Migrants in South Africa, 1860-1911* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1990).

Victoria's Diamond Jubilee celebrations, saw that there was good land for farming, and encouraged others to emigrate upon their return to India. The numbers of Indians in Canada were much lower than in South Africa, perhaps 5,000 at the height of early Indian immigration. Indian immigration to Canada before the advent of airplanes was almost entirely limited to British Columbia, in particular to Vancouver and Victoria. The immigrant population was composed almost entirely of Punjabi Sikhs, and, due to restrictions on family immigration, was predominantly male. Social and political life converged around the Gurdwara, the Sikh temple.[71]

Activists in South Africa and Canada developed local and transnational political organizations to resist anti-Indian legislation at the municipal, provincial, national, and imperial levels. This activism was centered around print culture forms: petitions, correspondence, telegrams, mass meeting resolutions, and pamphlets were the primary channels through which diasporic Indians tried to obtain redress. Even the Ghadr Party, which advocated violent resistance to the Raj, used print culture media in very similar ways to more moderate Indian nationalists. Periodicals published by diasporic activist-editors were fundamental to the propagation and dissemination of these politics.

The story of early South African Indian activism is often told as the story of Gandhi in South Africa.[72] Although Indians in Natal and the Transvaal wrote petitions to imperial and colonial officials from the 1870s onwards, no political organizations were established until after Gandhi's arrival in Natal in 1893. Gandhi was instrumental in establishing the Natal Indian

[71] Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, chapter five; Hugh Johnston, *The Voyage of the* Komagata Maru*: The Sikh Challenge to Canada's Colour Bar, Expanded and Fully Revised Edition* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1989, 2014), esp. chapters one and two; Johnston, *East Indians*, 8-9; Nayan Shah, *Stranger Intimacy: Contesting Race, Sexuality, and the Law in the North American West* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2011), 213; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 17-22.

[72] Robert A. Huttenback, *Gandhi in South Africa: British Imperialism and the Indian Question, 1860-1914* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971); Swan, *Gandhi*; Bhana, *Gandhi's Legacy*; Surendra Bhana and Goolam Vahed, *The Making of a Political Reformer: Gandhi in South Africa, 1893-1914* (New Delhi: Manohar Press, 2005); Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*.

Congress in 1894 and the Transvaal British Indian Association in 1903. Yet throughout his time in South Africa, Gandhi was both supported and challenged by a diverse group of historical actors.[73] Indeed, many initial supporters eventually became critics, including Tamil-speaking activist-editor P. S. Aiyar as well as Gujerati Muslim merchants Haji Ojeer Ally, Hajee Habib, Mohammed Cassim Anglia, and Dada Osman.[74]

Despite resistance and critique from within the South African Indian community, Gandhi was extremely successful in commanding the attention of a sympathetic audience in Britain and India.[75] As with other activist-editors in Canada and South Africa, Gandhi's transnational activism was formed within a diasporic and imperial print culture. The framing of immigration restriction as a transnational problem and the creation and circulation of transnational print culture were mutually constitutive.

Because both were self-governing colonies, the exclusion of Indian immigrants in Canada and South Africa was a more fraught imperial problem than in the Crown colonies (see chapter two). In addition, Indian political activism in South Africa and Canada peaked between 1907 and 1908 and again in 1913 to 1914. In British Columbia (as well as across the US northwest), September 1907 saw a series of riots in which white men attacked Asian neighborhoods, injuring many Asian men and causing widespread property damage. The Canadian and British Columbian governments responded with further restrictions on Asian—including, for the first time, Indian—immigration. In 1908, the Canadian Government proposed that the Indian

[73] Huttenback, *Gandhi in South Africa*; Swan, *Gandhi*; Bhana, *Gandhi's Legacy*; Bhana and Vahed, *Making*; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*.
[74] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 132, 179-82; Swan, *Gandhi*, 251; Bhana and Vahed, *Making*, 101, 119-21; B. Pachai, "The History of "Indian Opinion", 1903-14" (M. A. Thesis, University of South Africa) in *Archives Yearbook for South African History* (Cape Town: Cape & Transvaal Printers Ltd., 1963), 63-4.
[75] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*; Pachai, *International Aspects*, 34; Huttenback, *Gandhi in South Africa*, 52-3, 124, 207-9; Gregory, *East Africa,* chapter four; James Hunt, *Gandhi in London* (Revised Edition), (New Delhi: Promilla & Co. Publishers, 1993), chapters two, three, and four; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, chapter eleven; R. Srinivasan, "G. A. Natesan (1873-1949): Nationalist Publisher in a Colonial Context," *Indica* 38, nos. 1 and 2 (2001): 297.

population move to British Honduras, which they argued had a climate that was more suited to Indians than Canada's. Teja Singh, a Ghadr Party member, and other political leaders visited the proposed immigration site and publicly criticized the scheme. In South Africa, the Transvaal government instituted new restrictions on Indian mobility in 1906 by requiring Indians to carry an identification document with fingerprints. Gandhi started the passive resistance movement in 11 September 1906 in response; this movement soon expanded beyond the fingerprinting issue and spread from the Transvaal to include Natal Indians. Then in 1913 the passive resistance movement again expanded and re-energized with the inclusion of indentured laborers. In 1914, Gandhi entered negotiations with South African Minister of the Interior Jan Smuts to end the passive resistance movement and in June they concluded the "Gandhi-Smuts Agreement," honored later that year with the Indian Relief Bill. Although many South African Indians were unhappy with this settlement, white politicians (and occasionally Gandhi) celebrated it as the end of the "Asiatic trouble" in South Africa. Just as the situation in South Africa was calming down, Canadian tensions flared up as 500 Indians from East Asian ports sailed to Vancouver to challenge Canada's immigration restriction. The *S. S. Komagata Maru* was kept in port for three months until all but ten of immigrants were deported to India. Upon arrival in India, the police tried to force the passengers on board a special train to the Punjab and shooting erupted, leaving at least 26 dead.[1] The confluence of moments of heightened anti-Asiatic sentiment and the concomitant Indian response in both South Africa and Canada encouraged activists to think of their struggles as connected.

Tellingly, Indian activists in South Africa and Canada understood their struggle as mutual, and continually referenced each other's activities. Although activists monitored and reported on Indian affairs across the empire, South Africa and Canada emerged in this period as

flashpoints for racial crises on the question of Indian immigration. As a result, Indian papers in each colony frequently reported on and commented on developments in the other colony.[1] During the passive resistance movement, the *African Chronicle* reported that "the position of our compatriots in Canada is no better than what it is here in South Africa."[76] The *Aryan* followed up an article about the impact of the £3 tax on ex-indentured women in South Africa by asking "Dear readers what are you going to do for your sisters in Natal?"[77] While diasporic periodicals made a point of keeping track of the spread of racial legislation throughout the empire, articles referring to South Africa and Canada in conjunction or comparison with each other were especially common.[78]

Partly this was because the chronology and outcomes of the two resistance movements shared certain similarities. As *India* noted in November 1913, "As if the troubles of Indians in South Africa were not enough…there comes the news of a case of forcible deportation from British Columbia."[79] Indians in both colonies witnessed increasingly virulent assertions of self-government in defense of white democracy and decreasing willingness on the part of the imperial government to intervene on non-white subjects' defense. The major political movements in each colony—the passive resistance in South Africa and the *Komagata Maru* in Canada—garnered enough international attention to force colonial governments to institute Commissions of

---

[76] "The Empire Problems," *AC*, May 24, 1913. See also: "What the Canada Indians think of South African Indians," *AC*, 20 September 1913; Reuters (Victoria BC), telegraph (London, 27 May), quoted in "British Columbia's Action," *AC*, 30 May 1914; "Small Mutiny in South Africa," *The Hindu Weekly Journal 'Guddre [sic] (The Mutiny* No 9), published in Sanskrit in San Francisco, *O People of India Arise and Take Up Your Swords: Mutiny: The Enemy of the English Race: Hindu and Gumuhki [sic] Weekly Paper,* p. 17*,* trans. enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, Vancouver City Archives [henceforth VCA] H. H. Stevens Papers [henceforth SP] 509-D-7 file 1; "South Africa: A Moral," *Ghadr*, typescript headed "Abridged translation of passages from the issue of the 6th January" [1914?], National Archives Repository (Public Records of Central Government since 1910) [henceforth SAB] GG LEER Volume 900, folder 15/713); "News and Notes," *Aryan*, March-April 1912.

[77] News and Notes," *Aryan*, June 1912.

[78] Bombay memorial, quoted in "Indians in Colonies: A Strong Memorial, (cont'd): Canada," *AC*, 28 September 1912; "More of the Komagata Maru," *Bengalee*, 27 May 1914.

[79] "Notes and News," *India*, 28 November 1913. See also: "Deadlock in British Columbia," *India*, 12 June 1914; "The Reverends on the Hindu Problem," *Hindustanee*, 1 March 1914.

Enquiry. However, these Commissions failed to satisfy Indian opinion, and their unsatisfactory conclusions were catalyzing forces in the vitiation of the discourse of imperial citizenship. The turn away from the kind of plural citizenship allowed under empire and diaspora to a singular, racially- or geographically-defined nationalism separate from empire has its roots in part in the outcomes of diasporic Indian political activism at the turn of the century. My decision to put Canada and South Africa into the same frame of reference, therefore, follows the lead of the print culture archive while also recognizing the analytical value of concentrating on self-governing colonies as a way to illuminate imperial tensions.

At the same time, the demographic and political differences described above precluded close political cooperation between activists in South Africa and Canada. Although both parties identified a common cause against immigration restriction and specifically cited each other's struggles as connected and comparative, acts of political solidarity such as fundraising or coordination between activists never emerged in any depth between South Africa and Canada. Thus you have the irony of activists who enacted a transnational politics in relation to other countries (India, the US, England, Japan) but never with respect to each other. Activists in the two colonies referenced each other strategically in order to claim common cause and to advance their own political agenda. But they purposefully maintained a distance, allowing both Ghadr and INC-affiliated activists plausible deniability when confronted with aspects of the other's activism that they did not like.[80] This was, I would argue, a deliberate strategy: given their fundamental political differences, it was preferable to know fewer details in order to be able to allude to a distant political struggle in terms that supported one's own political agenda rather than dealing with the complex nuances of substantial transnational political engagement.

[80] As for example, during Ghadr-inspired violence on the part of would-be Canadian Indian immigrants ("Notes and News," *India*, 16 October 1914; "Notes: The Komagata Maru Enquiry," *Modern Review*, November 1914).

Political leaders in the two colonies occasionally directly criticized each other.[81] However, more political mileage could be reached by ignoring their differences and only referencing each other's struggles and the common, if contested, language of imperial citizenship. Transnational activism between South African and Canadian Indians remained at the level of discourse but not practice.[82] Tracking the circulation of imperial citizenship thus reveals a set of missed political opportunities.

This dissertation uses South Africa and Canada in order to explore a study of transnational history that attends to both connections *and* missed connections. As Elleke Boehmer has argued, historians must explore the friction, fractures, or gaps that characterized transnational activism.[83] Transnational history cannot simply be the happy, peaceful alternative to national historiography.[84] I argue that, in the case of activists in South Africa and Canada, intentional mistranslations and missed connections facilitated a discursive solidarity that was useful to both parties. This rhetorical strategy allowed activists in one location to build their political strength by referencing far distant struggles without having to account for the reality of the political movements they co-opted.

The medium is the message: The making of an Indian imperial print culture

[81] For Ghadr critiques of Gandhi and Gokhale, see: "South Africa: A Moral," *Ghadr*, 6 January [1914], translation, SAB GG LEER Volume 900, folder 15/713; "The Threat to Kill Sirandra Nath," *Ghadr*, 18 February 1914, translation, enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 26 January 1914, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1; "The Bad Mohamedan Leader has been Deposed," *Ghadr*, n.d., enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1. For Gandhi's criticism of the Ghadr party and other violent nationalists, see "The London Tragedy," *IO*, 19 July 1909.
[82] For a further development of this argument, see Irina Spector-Marks, "(Mis)Representing the *Komagata Maru* in Indian Print Cultures," in *Charting Imperial Itineraries: Unmooring the* Komagata Maru, eds. Satwinder Kaur Bains, Davina Bhandar, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Renisa Mawani (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, forthcoming).
[83] Elleke Boehmer, "Failure to connect: resistant modernities at national crossroads: Solomon Plaatje and Mohandas Gandhi," in *Beyond the Black Atlantic: Relocating Modernization and Technology*, W. Goebel and Saskia Schabo, eds., (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 47-62. See also: Anna Tsing, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
[84] Isabel Hofmeyr and Michelle Williams, "South Africa–India: Historical Connections, Cultural Circulations and Socio-political Comparisons," in *South Africa and India: Shaping the Global South,* Isabel Hofmeyr and Michelle Williams, eds. (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2011), 18-9.

Imperial citizenship was a discourse whose meanings were shaped by the texts through which it travelled. The discourse of imperial citizenship and the material forms through which it was expressed were mutually constitutive. Activist-editors used newspapers to articulate political positions, support political organizations, and organize political action. Scholars of both *Indian Opinion* and *Ghadr* have emphasized the central role of the paper in expressing, promoting, and creating political activity.[85] Gandhi himself said that *satyagraha* would not have been possible without *Indian Opinion*.[86] Although these are the best known examples, their modus operandi was germane to diasporic periodicals more generally. Newspapers were not only a place where political ideas were discussed, they were a vehicle for political mobilization. Editors and readers together created and disputed the meaning of imperial citizenship.

The concluding chapters of the dissertation offer an analysis "textualization of citizenship" that examines some of the material practices by which activists created participatory citizenship in these periodicals.[87] I focus primarily on the weekly or monthly periodicals produced by activist-editors in Natal and British Columbia. These journals offer a unique record of political organizations, meetings, speeches, and correspondence that is no longer archived elsewhere. Because of the editor's practice of quoting documents from multiple locations and political perspectives, they provide access not merely to the editor-activist's discourse, but to a myriad of complementary and competing voices of diasporic activism. One weekly edition might reprint material on imperial citizenship from newspapers and political meetings from London,

[85] Uma Shashikant Mesthrie, "From Advocacy to Mobilization: *Indian Opinion*, 1903-1914," in *South African's Alternative Press: Voices of Protest and Resistance, 1800s-1960s*, ed. Les Switzer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 116; Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 109.
[86] Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 119.
[87] Textualization of citizenship is Sukanya Banerjee's phrase (Banerjee, *Becoming*, 5) but I differ from Banerjee in that in addition to analyzing the discourse of imperial citizenship as it occurred in diasporic and nationalist texts, I also argue that modes of text production and circulation were themselves practices of citizenship. I use textualization of citizenship to mean both the language of citizenship and the ways in which citizenship was created through textual practices.

East Anglia, Alnwick, Glasgow, Dar Es Salaam, Basutoland, Bombay, and British Columbia.[88] These citations and reproductions bolstered an argument about the imperial importance of the issue, while also re-inscribing an imperial geography of unity that contrasted with white settler attempts to draw racial and national divisions. The print culture they created was at once imperial, national, and diasporic.[89]

The method and forms of material production of these journals were constitutive of their message; that is to say, activists did not merely advocate for an imperial citizenship in these journals, they practiced forms of citizenship through participation in a print culture which they self-consciously made imperial through circulation and citation.[90] The languages, labor, location, circulation, and sources of the periodicals, pamphlets, speeches, and governmental publications that made up imperial-diasporic print culture *mattered*. Material printed in Tamil, for instance, was both a way of including the often-disenfranchised indentured and ex-indentured population in South Africa, while also making an implicit argument that Tamil was a language worthy of recognition by the South African government, which required European language literacy for entry to the country.[91] My work thus engages Isabel Hofmeyr's call for attention to the materiality of diasporic presses, by examining the various ways in which imperial print culture shaped and was shaped by the discourse of imperial citizenship.[92]

---

[88] *Indian Opinion* 28 January 1914 is just one example of the diversity of citations in this diasporic print culture.
[89] Isabel Hofmeyr, "Indian Ocean Lives and Letters," *English in Africa* 35, no. 1 (May 2008): 11-25; Hofmeyr et al, "Print Cultures," 7; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, esp. 36-46; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 99-126.
[90] Thanks to Isabel Hofmeyr for helping me recognize the importance of this point.
[91] For the intersection of language and citizenship, see chapter five. On the importance of Tamil publications to political activism: "Indentured Indians: What May We Do?" *AC*, 29 April 1911; "Mr. Natesan on the Indian Question," *AC*, 5 August 1911. On the importance of a Tamil-language activities: B. Maharaj, "Correspondence," *AC*, 11 July 1908; "Maritzburg Items," *AC*, 8 May 1909.
[92] Hofmeyr et al, "Print Cultures," 7. See also: Tony Ballantyne, "Reading the newspaper in Colonial Otago," *Journal of New Zealand Studies: Special Issue: Communicating Culture in Colonial New Zealand*, eds. Tony Ballantyne, Lachy Paterson, and Angela Wanhalla, No. 12 (2011).

Crucially, imperial citizenship was a discourse articulated, debated, and refined within a print culture that was shaped by imperial structures—structures of government, commerce, transportation, and education. Even as those print cultures imagined and enacted other networks, the presence of the British empire loomed large. Indian diasporic presses relied on imperial sources of information (whether official channels like Parliamentary debates or demi-official ones like Reuters reports), travelled on imperial steamships, railways, telegraph lines, and post offices, were written in English as well as other vernaculars, and looked to imperial centers such as London and Delhi for support and authentication.[93] Tony Ballantyne's reminder that the imperial web was itself multiple and interacted with other non-imperial webs is salient, but so is his insistence on the web as a power-laden structure.[94]

At the same time, these journals provided an important space through which Indian activists could challenge governmental/legal hegemony by articulating and practicing alternative forms of citizenship in print. Through printing and reprinting petitions, public meetings, correspondence, and other texts; advocating for and publicizing political organizations; and providing a space for the explication and discussion of governmental documents, these periodicals were a form of activism in and of themselves. While editors conceived of their role as that of educators of their readers, readers and contributors often responded creatively and cantankerously to such admonishments. From confrontations over how to properly address a

[93] Alex Nalbach,"'The Software of Empire': Telegraphic News Agencies and Imperial Publicity, 1865-1914," and Julie Codell, "Introduction: Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press," in *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press*, ed. Julie Codell (New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 2003); Chandrika Kaul, *Reporting the Raj: The British Press and India, c. 1880-1922* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003); Tony Ballantyne, "Remaking the World: Communication, Colonialism and Global Connections," in *Empires and the Reach of the Global, 1870-1945*, eds. Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014); Simon J. Potter, *News and the British World: The Emergence of an Imperial Press System, 1876-1922* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Deep Kanta Lahiri Choudhury, *Telegraphic Imperialism: Crisis and Panic in the Indian Empire, c. 1830* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Oz Frankel, "Blue Books and the Victorian Reader," *Victorian Studies* (Winter 2004): 308-318; Daniel Headrick, "A Double-Edged Sword: Communications and Imperial Control in British India," *Historical Social Research* 35, no. 1 (2010): 51-65.

[94] Ballantyne, "Reading the Archive," 113.

petition to debates over which book offered the best history of the Magna Carta, knowledge of print culture etiquette was a form of participatory citizenship.[95] Indians who were denied the franchise used these periodicals to discuss their rights to citizenship, but also to provide evidence of the cultural, political, and literal literacy that they believed indicated their capacity for citizenship.

Dissertation structure

Chapter one introduces the periodicals that form the bulk of my primary sources and which were the center of diasporic political activism. This chapter describes the editors' politics, the papers' readership and circulation, and the strategy of citations and quotations that created a print sphere that was at once imperial and diasporic. The understanding of how these periodicals articulated and circulated the discourse of imperial citizenship underlies the next two chapters, which focus on analyzing the discourse itself. Chapter two lays out the interrelationship between imperial citizenship, immigration restriction, and self-government. Chapter three nuances this transnationalism by emphasizing the importance of local racial contexts in shaping the connotations of imperial citizenship. Meanings accrued to imperial citizenship as the discourse moved between Tamil and Anglo-Jewish newspapermen in Durban, Sikh and Irish immigrants in Vancouver, and English and Parsi politicians in London.[96] Chapter four examines the expression of political activism in diasporic periodicals. Through the reproduction of government documents, scrupulously detailed accounts of political organizations' meetings, and advocacy and fundraising campaigns carried out within the newspaper itself, these periodicals envisioned and created a politics of imperial citizenship. Chapter five further analyzes the relationship of literacy and citizenship. The writing, illustrating, and printing of addresses, petitions,

[95] See chapter five.
[96] P. S. Aiyar, H. S. L. Polak, Taraknath Das, J. E. Bird, Lord Ampthill and Dadabhai Naoroji, to indicate just a few key interlocutors of the many thousands involved in the demand for recognition of Indian imperial citizenship.

correspondence columns, and other material were crucially important evidence of Indians' capacity for citizenship. Readers and editors alike debated and contested the proper forms of writing as they expressed and demonstrated their citizenship in a vibrant transnational print culture.

Conclusion

Indian assertions of imperial citizenship, coded in racialized terms, were crucial to emergent Indian nationalism from the nineteenth century until the political upheavals of 1914, yet they remain understudied by historians. The periodicals published by Indians overseas offer key insights into why imperial citizenship served as a hegemonic discourse for so long. In the context of Britain's ostensibly non-racial empire, in which Britishness nonetheless served as the pinnacle of moral aspirations and political power, Indian activists scrambled to navigate racial hierarchies that were both discursive and politically materialized. In doing so, they used the language of imperial citizenship, Britishness, and whiteness to challenge the racial divisions made by European settlers. They did so by asserting that imperial citizenship was non-racial but at the same time making inherently and explicitly racialized defenses of their right to imperial citizenship over and above other ethnic groups within the empire. These tactics were incredibly localized, even as the overarching language of imperial citizenship circulated transnationally. The transnational circulation and local inflections of imperial citizenship were articulated and performed in the publications of diasporic activists. By analyzing both the discourse of imperial citizenship and the material production and dissemination of that discourse, this dissertation argues that diasporic Indians navigated the global color line by aspiring to whiteness in the name of an imperial citizenship that was founded on racial discrimination while purporting to stand for equality and justice.

Chapter One

Citation and Circulation: Creating an Imperial Print Culture

Imperial citizenship emerged as the dominant discourse out of a self-consciously imperial print culture produced by Indian activist-editors in diaspora. These editors, who were also often local political leaders, published weekly or monthly periodicals. Despite the papers' small size and the challenges of budget, staff, labor, and material, these editors aimed to reach a market that was both imperial and diasporic.[1] In doing so, they used transnational circulation and cut-and-paste techniques of reproduction from government documents, newspapers, and books from across the empire. These techniques were not just a strategy by editors to minimize cost and labor—although they were that as well. The citation and reproduction of British, colonial, and Indian texts was also a creative imagination of a particular version of imperial space and imperial polity. Julie Codell argues that the press "reshaped the imagined, the virtual, the geopolitical, and perhaps even the physical geographies between Britain and the colonies."[2] The editors of the periodicals I examine re-imagined multiple geographies at once: imperial, nationalist, diasporic, pan-Asian, and Indian Ocean, amongst others.[3]

Amongst the many intersecting and overlapping networks of print and activism, however, imperial citizenship was the identity most consistently postulated across space, time, and political affiliation. That imperial citizenship was imagined and enacted

[1] The only exception here was the *Ghadr* paper, which aimed at a diasporic audience that moved far beyond the confines of the British empire. However, as we shall see, Ghadr activists also produced other newspapers and pamphlets that were directed at an imperial audience.
[2] Codell, "Introduction," 18.
[3] Mark Ravinder Frost, "Asia's Maritime Networks and the Colonial Public Sphere, 1840-1920," *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 6, no. 2 (December 2004): 87; Mark Ravindar Frost, "'That Great Ocean of Idealism': Calcutta, the Tagore Circle, and the Idea of Asia, 1900-1920," in *Indian Ocean Studies: Cultural, Social, and Political Perspectives*, eds. Shanti Moorthy and Ashraf Jamal (New York: Routledge, 2010), 252-3, 276; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 14, 72, 86; Hofmeyr et al., "Introduction," 5; Potter, *News*, 160.

through diasporic print culture. The mobility of these texts mirrored the mobility that Indian immigrants desired and made an implicit argument for empire as a meeting ground in contrast to white settler visions of a segregated empire. When editors juxtaposed articles from the *Manchester Guardian* and *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* or a Blue Book with a report on the INC annual meeting, they were not merely stating their claim to be imperial citizens; they were creating an ideal empire through the (re)production of texts. The choices of what to print, what documents to reprint, and their target audience all combined to produce an implicit vision of the nature of imperial unity. These editors not only explicitly articulated Indian claims to imperial citizenship, they imagined and manifested an imperial citizenship through the medium of their papers.

Meet the Press: Periodicals, editors, and their world

This dissertation is animated by eight Indian periodicals published by six editors. These editors often shared strikingly similar strategies of production and dissemination, even as they challenged each other's politics. Four of these papers were published in Durban, two in Victoria, and one in Vancouver, cities that constituted the hub of Indian presence in Natal and British Columbia.[4] These journals were at the heart of South African and Canadian Indian political activism and their editors were often crucial political leaders in the community. I also include excerpts from *Ghadr*, which, although it was published out of San Francisco, played an important role in Canadian Indian politics. The editors whose works are analyzed here include Mohandas Gandhi, Panchapikisa

[4] It is striking that even throughout the passive resistance movement, which originated in the Transvaal, no Indian periodicals appeared outside of Natal. Clearly Durban remained the political and economic center, at least for the literate South African Indian community. Because Indian, South Asian, or Malayan experience in the Cape Colony was so distinct from Indian experience in Natal and the Transvaal, I have not looked at newspapers from the Cape, although I have noted those occasions on which Durban-based periodicals reported on Cape affairs.

Subramania Aiyar, Mohammed Cassim Anglia, Sunder Singh, Husain Rahim, and Lala Har Dayal.[5]

Most well-known of the South African Indian newspapers, or perhaps of all diasporic publications at this time, is Gandhi's *Indian Opinion*, which was published from 1903 until the mid-twentieth century.[6] Although *Indian Opinion* had several different editors from its inception, it was Gandhi's brainchild, and he paid meticulous attention to what topics were covered and how they were discussed.[7] *Indian Opinion* first appeared in English, Gujarati, Tamil, and Hindi. This eventually proved too much labor, especially given Gandhi's poor Hindi and non-existent Tamil, and the paper became a dual-language publication in 1905.[8] *Indian Opinion* was originally published by the International Printing Press in Durban. The press was originally owned by Madanjit Viyavaharik, although Gandhi became sole owner of the paper in October 1904.[9] At the same time, Gandhi moved the press to Phoenix, a communal settlement dedicated to simple living, European and Indian cooperation, and other elements of Gandhi's developing philosophy. All members of the Phoenix ashram helped produce the paper.[10]

---

[5] Technically, Gandhi was never editor of *Indian Opinion*. During the period I study, the paper had five editors: Mansukhlal Hiralal Nazar (1903-1904), Albert West (1904-1906), Herbert Kitchin (1906), Reverend Joseph J. Doke (1913), and Henry Salomon Leon Polak (1906-1916). Nonetheless, Gandhi maintained oversight of the publication, suggesting material and providing much of the ideas, as well as writing many pieces, especially in the Gujarati section. *Indian Opinion* remains so entirely Gandhi's brainchild that it makes sense to refer to him as editor throughout, although other editors, particularly Polak, certainly put their own stamp on the publication (Mesthrie, "From Advocacy to Mobilization," 102, 104, 106; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi,* 74, 80; Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 28-29; Margaret Chatterjee, *Gandhi and his Jewish friends* (Houndmills: Macmillan Academic and Professional, Ltd., 1992), 42, 46; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 43).

[6] Gandhi left the newspaper in the care of his son Manilal when he returned to India in 1914. Although he maintained an interest in the publication, and occasionally submitted articles, his close involvement with *Indian Opinion* ended at this time.

[7] See footnote 5.

[8] "Our Tamil and Hindi Columns," *IO*, 3 February 1906; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 5, 51-2; Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 28; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 113-4.

[9] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 2, 5, 46; Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 28; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 102.

[10] "Manager's Notice," *IO*, 14 January 1905; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 74-5; Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 32; Hofmeyr, " Lives and Letters," 15-16; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 47, 50, 66.

In 1910, *Indian Opinion* had determined to refuse advertisements for materials that Gandhi deemed injurious, including "Intoxicating Liquors, Medicines, Cigarettes and advertisements of an indecent or gambling nature."[11] In 1912, *Indian Opinion* stopped all advertisements, arguing that consumerism was incompatible with Gandhi's principles of swaraj and swadeshi.[12] Also in 1912, Gandhi converted *Indian Opinion*, the International Printing Press, and the land, machinery, and buildings at Phoenix into a cooperative between himself, Omar Hajee Amod Johari, Parsee Rustomjee Jeewanjee Ghorcoodoo (Durban), Herman Kallenbach, Lewis Walter Ritch (Johannesburg), and Pranjivandas Jugivan Mehta (Rangoon). Gandhi intended this collective to be representative of the paper's status as the voice of the Indian community (*Indian Opinion*). However, Gandhi remained as Manager of the Trust and the Phoenix Trust account was opened in his name.[13] Gandhi and subsequent historians have agreed that *Indian Opinion* was integral to the development of *satyagraha* and the establishment of communal living at Phoenix (and later Tolstoy Farm outside Johannesburg).[14] Gandhi's political philosophy matured in and through *Indian Opinion*.

Although *Indian Opinion* is perhaps the most studied diasporic Indian newspaper, other editors challenged Gandhi's claim to exclusively represent "Indian opinion" in South Africa. P. S. Aiyar and M. C. Anglia published newspapers which offer a perspective on opposition to Gandhi's leadership from different factions in the South African Indian community. Originally supporters of Gandhi, Aiyar and Anglia each

[11] "Advertisers, Please Note," *IO*, 8 January 1910.
[12] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 65.
[13] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912; "The Phoenix Trust," *IO*, 14 September 1912.
[14] Mohandas K. Gandhi, *Autobiography: The Story of my Experiments with Truth* (New York: Dover, 1983), 252; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 119; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 3.

represented segments of the community who eventually came to disagree fundamentally with Gandhi's strategies, tactics, goals, and compromises.[15] A Madrassi Brahmin, Aiyar saw himself as the champion of the Tamil-speaking population of South Africa, a population consisting of both the indentured population and the colonial-born population, who were frequently descendants of indentured Indians, but were often educated in English. By the 1900s, colonial-born young men formed a growing community of urban white-collar workers whose political concerns and communal identities overlapped with but were distinct from the Gujarati-speaking merchants who had previously dominated the political scene. By publishing in Tamil and English, Aiyar presented himself as a leader of the Tamil community and specifically as a counterpoint to Gandhi, whose knowledge of Tamil was slim and who, despite his claim to speak for all Indians, primarily represented Gujarati merchant interests.[16] Aiyar, an erstwhile Gandhi supporter, became increasingly critical and by 1914 was staunchly opposed to Gandhi and his fellow activists and editors at *Indian Opinion*.[17] Although Aiyar himself characterized his supporters as the "minority, very small in number," he founded several important political organizations in South Africa.[18] Like Gandhi, Aiyar also utilized family and political connections to gain an audience in the subcontinent for his agenda.[19] Anglia was a prominent Gujarati Muslim merchant. A leading member of the Natal Indian Congress,

[15] For political disagreements amongst South African Indians, see introduction.
[16] "Mightier than the Sword," *AC*, 26 August 1911. See also: Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 65-7, 66; Mesthrie, "Advocacy,"101.
[17] P. S. Aiyar and M. C. Anglia both particularly hated Polak, whom they attacked as Jewish, European, and a foreigner to the Indian community. Part of their irritation with Gandhi stemmed from the fact that he preferred European workers to colonial Indian supporters ("Notes & Comments: Why Mr. Gandhi is a Failure," *AC*, 19 April 1912; "From the Editor's Chair: A Lost Opportunity," *AC*, 18 October 1913; "Correspondence: Transvaal Indian Mohamedan Congress," *Indian Views* [henceforth *IV*], 26 November 1915).
[18] "Mr. Gandhi and his opponents," *AC*, 1 August 1914. For a discussion of Aiyar as political organizer, see chapter four.
[19] "Indian Political Situation: A Dialogue: Imaginary and Real: Scene 1," *AC*, 4 July 1914.

Anglia led the NIC in 1910 to split with Gandhi and founded his paper in 1914 to articulate the ways in which the Muslim merchant community, which originally formed the basis of Gandhi's political support in South Africa, was disaffected with his leadership.[20] Anglia and, especially, Aiyar offer two important counterpoints to the histories of South African Indian politics and print culture which have been dominated by Gandhi's outsized historiographical imprint.

Despite recurrent difficulties keeping his periodicals solvent, Aiyar was an important publisher, editor, and political activist in early twentieth century South Africa. The very first Indian journal in Natal was *Indian World*, which was briefly published by Aiyar in 1898.[21] Unfortunately, I have been unable to find any extant copies. Aiyar's second paper, *Colonial Indian News,* was a weekly published in English from 18 May 1901. A Tamil edition was planned for 15 July 1901 and eventually appeared on 16 August 1901. The labor involved in writing, editing, and printing in two languages meant a decrease in length from two English pages to one English and one Tamil page.[22] The paper was originally published from Pietermaritzburg, but moved to Durban in July 1902.[23] Publication continued on a weekly basis (with occasional gaps) until sometime in late 1902 or early 1903, when the new Durban offices burnt down.[24] Although Aiyar

[20] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 179.
[21] Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 100-1.
[22] *Colonial Indian News* suffered from a chronic shortage of labor. Aiyar advertised for an Indian compositor ("none but steady men") from 24 January 1902 to 21 February 1902 and again ("none but steady and honest men") in 20 September 1902.
[23] NAB CSO 1674, 3171/1901. Plagued by bad luck, several important machine parts were broken during the move and shortly after Aiyar established himself in Durban, the printing offices burnt down ("Notice to our Subscribers," *CIN*, 30 August 1902).
[24] The last issue of the *CIN* in the Gandhi-Luthuli Documentation Centre, which is the most extensive repository for Natal Indian historical documents, appears as 15 November 1902. On 3 January 1903, Aiyar wrote to the Pietermaritzburg government that *CIN* had suspended publication due to the office fire. Government correspondence dated 22 June 1904 says that the last issue of *CIN* was published in February 1903 and that Aiyar has since filed for bankruptcy. I have not been able to find extant copies of any issues after 15 November 1902. (Copies of Aiyar-Government correspondence dated 21 November 1901, 30

intended to resume publication shortly, various factors, which probably included Aiyar's recurrent illness and constant shortness of funds, ended *Colonial Indian News*'s career.[25]

In December 1907, Aiyar applied to the government for a license to start another periodical, and in June 1908 the first issue of the Tamil-English weekly *African Chronicle* appeared. Aiyar originally intended *African Chronicle* to be in Tamil only, but, apparently in response to appeals by his readers, he transitioned into a Tamil-English publication. Although a reader requested that Aiyar expand to include "that proposed national script Hindi—Devanagarie [sic]," *African Chronicle* remained a dual language publication.[26] In early issues, English took up about four pages, with Tamil almost double that. With the start of the passive resistance movement, the paper expanded in October 1908 to six to eight English pages weekly, even stretching on occasion to ten or twelve pages. On 12 September 1914, Aiyar declared that in order to keep up with the war news the *African Chronicle* would transition to offer a daily edition in Tamil and a weekly edition in English and Tamil. By 20 May 1915, the success of the Tamil daily had

---

August 1902, and 3 January 1903 precede the microfilm copies of *Colonial Indian News* at the Gandhi Luthuli Documentation Centre. See also: Acting Chief Magistrate to Natal Colonial Secretary, 22 June 1904, NAB CSO 1674, 3171/1901).

[25] As late as 12 March 1904, Aiyar was applying to the Colonial Secretary on *Colonial Indian News* letterhead for a month's extension to pay his license fee for the paper. By 3 December 1904 government officials were debating whether to fine Aiyar's estate £10 for not paying the license on time as well as collecting the license fee, or whether merely fining him would suffice (NAB CSO Minute Papers 1757/1904, 2595/1904. In February 1902, Aiyar apologized to readers for the typos in the previous week's newspaper; he had been unable to proofread it because of illness ("City Schools," *CIN*, 14 February 1902). In April 1902, Aiyar again apologized to readers that the paper had been late or inconsistent for several months due to his "protracted ill-ness [sic]" and he asked subscribers "to put up with these shortcomings until such time as the Editor is in a position to resume work as usual" ("Notice to our Subscribers," *CIN*, 23 April 1902).

[26] B. Maharaj (20 June 1908) "Correspondence: Appreciations," *AC*, 11 July 1908. At some point, *African Chronicle* must have added a Gujarati column, since an article in 1921 apologizes for the shortage of Gujarati news due to lack of a Gujarati compositor and hopes to have more again soon ("Publisher's Notice," *AC*, 28 October 1921). The announcement of when the Gujarati section began or ceased to be published does not appear in any of the English-language issues I have seen.

encouraged Aiyar to begin offering one to two pages of English news daily.[27] However, this was to prove too much labor, and from January 1916 to March 1916 the English publication was at most a paragraph or two. In March 1916 full-length pages in English resumed intermittently. From July 1917 to January 1918, July to September 1919, and April to November 1920 the *African Chronicle* was only published in Tamil. The newspaper ceased publication altogether in 1921. Throughout his publishing career, Aiyar remained devoted to creating a political community and identify for colonial-born South African Indians. This political goal was reflected in his commitment (in the face of near-constant financial and labor troubles) to publishing in both English and Tamil. These language choices were central to the political identity Aiyar imagined for South African Indians: English-educated members of an imperial community who retained strong links with their Indian heritage.

Indian Views was founded in July 1914 by Mohammed Cassim Anglia and published in Gujarati and English.[28] Another former Gandhi supporter, Anglia formed *Indian Views* seemingly with the main political goal of discrediting Gandhi and opposing the Gandhi-Smuts settlement of 1914. *Indian Views* focused in its early years on articulating the politics of Natal Muslim merchants, combining opposition to the 1914 settlement with repetitions of loyalty to the throne and the empire, which featured prominently during World War I.

[27] GLDC's microfilm had only the Tamil daily from 26 December 1914-20 May 1915. It is not clear whether the English part of the weekly was published during this time period or not. ("Ourselves," *AC*, 12 September 1914; "Ourselves," *AC*, 20 May 1915).

[28] The paper was sold in 1919 on Anglia's death to Ebrahim Jeewa and in 1939 to Moosa Meer, who continued to run the paper until 1965 (Thembisa Waetjen and Goolam Vahed, "The Diaspora at Home: *Indian Views* and the Making of Zuleikha Mayat's Public Voice," *Africa* 81, no. 1 (2011): 26-28).

In Canada, there was an even sharper political difference between the two primary editors in this period. Sunder Singh was a professor, editor, and activist based primarily in eastern Canada, far from the center of Canadian Indian life in British Columbia. He was most successful at building alliances with white Canadians who accepted his claims to be representative of "Indian opinion."[29] Other Indian leaders protested this designation. Rahim wrote that "the Canadian politicians and their flunky press have hastened to label Dr. Sundra [sic] Singh of the 'Sansar' as the leader, though the fact is he is just leading himself, by himself, and for himself."[30]

Singh published *The Aryan* on a monthly basis from August 1911 to November 1912 out of Victoria. The title *Aryan* was part of a larger project of emphasizing the commonalities (racial, political, linguistic, religious) and connections between Britons and Indians (see chapter three). The very first issue declared,

> "The Aryan is published to show our friends the Westerners, that the Hindus and they are one, being sprung from the same stock…We believe the various colonies need the Hindu…There is a great deal of ignorance regarding the Hindu abroad which we shall try to dispel to the best of our ability. And last of all, let us repeat that what the Hindu wants is a 'square deal.'"[31]

Singh explicitly directed his work at a white Christian audience and his rhetoric reflects this orientation.

In stark contrast to Singh's moderate, pro-imperialist politics, the political leaders of the Indian community in British Columbia were almost exclusively members of the radical Ghadr party, which advocated violent overthrow of the British Raj.[32] Lala Har

[29] Singh worked closely with Reverend Hall of the Victoria Hindu Friends Society and with several female Christian reformers in eastern Canada where he was co-founder of the Canada India Committee.
[30] "The Sansar," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.
[31] "Still They Come," *Aryan*, August 1911.
[32] Johnston, *East Indians*, 7, 9.

Dayal edited the eponymous *Ghadr* out of San Francisco. The first issue appeared in November 1913 in Urdu, with a Gurmukhi edition in December 1913, and a smaller Gujarati edition in May 1914.[33] I have included excerpts from *Ghadr* throughout the dissertation because although it was published in the US, its impact was stunningly transnational and many Ghadr Party members were important activists in Canada. *Ghadr* provides important points of contrast and comparison with the other periodicals I analyze, which were much less overtly anti-British. However, it is important to note that I only have worked with sections of *Ghadr* that were intercepted and translated by the Canadian or Indian governments. There are therefore important questions about selection and translation bias that affect my use of *Ghadr* articles.

Ghadr activists also published other journals, however. Husain Rahim was the editor of *The Hindustanee. The Hindustanee* was the official organ of the United India League, a Vancouver-based political organization led by several Ghadr Party members.[34] However, unlike *Ghadr* itself, which circulated secretly, was published only in Indian languages, and was intended for an Indian nationalist audience, *The Hindustanee* was published in English in order to explain Indian grievances to a white Canadian audience. The *Hindustanee* was issued monthly from January 1914 to June 1914. Typical issues were 12 pages, but in June 1914 that was increased to 16 pages in order to report fully on the *Komagata Maru* crisis. The *Hindustanee* is the most explicitly anti-imperial of the English-language publications analyzed in this dissertation, but it was much more moderate than the *Ghadr*, since Rahim intended *The Hindustanee* to gain white Canadians' sympathy and support.

[33] Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 37.
[34] Johnston, *Voyage*, 26-7.

The last newspaper I analyze in depth was *The Sansar*, which was published sporadically in Victoria in both Punjabi and English. It is unclear who the editor of *Sansar* was or how long exactly it was extant for. I have only been able to locate a January and June 1914 issue, both of which were about one English page and between five to seven pages in Punjabi, some of which was translated by Canadian immigration officials.[35] Kornel Chang identifies Husain Rahim as the editor and says that it started in 1913, while Hugh M. Johnston says that *Sansar* was published by Kapoor Singh, later joined by Sunder Singh, beginning in 1912 with handwritten copies and only printed in 1913.[36] The Punjabi article calling Conservative Member of Parliament H. H. Stevens a "~~Foul beasts~~ Bastard [sic]" and the declaration that "The treatment of the Hindus in Canada and South Africa is prompted by the British Government to ill-treat the Hindus as much as possible" certainly seem more in line with Rahim's politics than with Singh's frequent declarations in support of the British empire and calls for unity between Britons and Indians.[37] However, the June 1914 issue of the *Sansar* spoke approvingly of Sunder Singh's work with white Canadians. In the same month, *The Hindustanee*, which was edited by Rahim, sharply criticized Sunder Singh and identified him as the editor of the *Sansar*.[38] It is possible that there were two different periodicals by the same name around the same time, one in Punjabi and English, and another just in English, and that historians have confused the two. Alternatively, Kapoor Singh and Sunder Singh might have taken

[35] Translations by immigration or intelligence officials are obviously suspect due to these officials' interest in imprisoning or deporting revolutionaries (or, in the case of immigration officers, any Indians).
[36] Kornel Chang, *Pacific Connections: The Making of the US-Canadian Borderlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 131; Johnston, *Voyage*, 32; I.M. Muthanna, *People of India in North America* Volume 1 (Bangalore: Lotus Printers, 1975), 165. For clarity's sake, and because I believe it to be the most likely scenario, I refer to Sunder Singh as the editor of the *Sansar* for the rest of the dissertation.
[37] "India the Gold Mine," *Sansar*, January 1914. This typescript is possibly a translation (VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1).
[38] "The Sansar," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.

advantage of white Canadians' ignorance to espouse more radical politics in Punjabi than in English. The most likely possibility, given immigration officials' ignorance and anti-Indian bias, is that not all of the pages identified in translation as *The Sansar* were in fact that publication, or that officials intentionally or mistakenly mistranslated the Punjabi sections to make them appear more revolutionary than they were.[39]

South African Indian periodicals, particularly *Indian Opinion*, have received much more attention from historians than the Canadian periodicals. In Canada, with its smaller Indian population, journals were short-lived, ephemeral affairs.[40] Histories of Canadian Indian periodicals have tended to be overshadowed by *Ghadr*, obscuring the more moderate politics of Sunder Singh and the strategic English-language imperialism of Ghadr activists like Rahim. Despite their significant political differences, these editors were united not only in their recognition of a shared problem of immigration restriction but also in their struggles to build communities through print. This dissertation puts *Indian Opinion* into a broader context of diasporic Indian print culture, examining the extent to which Gandhi's approach was unique and the extent to which his practices were part of a larger culture of diasporic print activism. Isabel Hofmeyr's recent *Gandhi's Printing Press: Experiments in Slow Reading* argues that Gandhi used the printing press

[39] Similar confusion was expressed by Canadian and London officials about *Ghadr*. Officials were unsure whether Ghadr, Ghudre, and Gaddar were the same publication or not, since it was printed in two different "dialects", Gurmukhi and Urdu (Chambers to Capt. P. W. Kenny, War Office, London, 18 January 1916, LAC, Department of the Secretary of State, Chief Press Censor, 1915-1920, RG6-E, Volume 579 File 251).
[40] Raj Kumar Hans, "Punjabi Press and Immigrant Culture in British Columbia between Wars," *Economic and Political Weekly* 33, no. 16 (April 1998): 885. Several of these publications were so short-lived that I have been unable to find extant copies. These include *Yugantar* which ran sporadically from 1906 to 1910; *Swadeshi Sevak*, which was edited in Urdu and Punjabi by Ghadr Party members G. D. Kumar and Harnam Singh; and the bimonthly periodical *Free Hindusthan* published by Ghadr Party member Taraknath Das in 1908, first out of Vancouver, then Seattle, and then New York (Muthanna, *People*, 62, 82; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 28). Like the other papers analyzed here, *Free Hindusthan* also had a transnational politics and audience, with at least 2,000 copies distributed worldwide (Seema Sohi, "Repressing the 'Hindu Menace,': Race, Anarchy, and Indian Anticolonialism," in *The Sun Never Sets: South Asian Migrants in an Age of U. S. Power*, eds. Vivek Bald, Miabi Chatterjee, Sujani Reddy, and Manu Vimalassery (New York: New York University, 2013), 54-6).

and *Indian Opinion* as a place in which to practice *swaraj*: the deliberateness, slowness, and reflection which were necessary to self-rule.[41] For Gandhi, *swaraj* was as much about individual self-control as about state autonomy and the training offered in *Indian Opinion* was a critical part of that development. Taken collectively, the decision to move the printing press to an ashram on Phoenix, to require everyone who lived on the ashram to participate in the labor of printing (assisted by two unnamed African women who did the heaviest work), to refuse advertisements of all kinds, and Gandhi's staunch defense of freedom of reproduction regardless of copyright, make him an outlier amongst the community of diasporic printer-activists.[42] Yet in many ways *Indian Opinion* was actually quite similar to the other periodicals examined here. Like *Indian Opinion*, *Ghadr*, too, was printed from an ashram by volunteers. The ashram and the printing projects were central to Ghadr's vision of Indian nationalism, just as Gandhi saw *swaraj* being worked out in the production of *Indian Opinion*. Both ashrams prided themselves on being "'devoid of any casteism, racism, religious bigotry and sectarianism of any kind. All who lived there were just Indian.'"[43] Despite their radically different political goals and strategies (the Ghadr Party was highly critical of Gandhi's non-violence and vice versa), Har Dayal and Gandhi envisioned and created very similar communities of political print.

Modes of citation and circulation practiced by *Indian Opinion* were common to larger colonial, transnational, and oceanic print communities. Cut-and-paste techniques

[41] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 90-4. See also: Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 99.
[42] Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 104-5, 112; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 59-67, 155-7.
[43] Vatuk, quoted in Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 37. Although this is the description by a Ghadr Party member about Har Dayal's ashram, it echoes many of Gandhi's claims about Tolstoy Farm (M. K. Gandhi, *Satygraha in South Africa* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Trust, 1968) http://www.mkgandhi.org/ebks/satyagraha_in_south_africa.pdf, 219-20, 224-5, 276.

were a useful strategy for periodicals struggling to manage on small budgets and with restraints of technology, materials, and labor. [44] Other periodicals, as will be shown below, quoted in part or in full from other newspapers, books, political manifestos, government documents, and Reuter's reports. Many of Gandhi's practices were simply the shared strategies of printer-editor-activists struggling to produce a newspaper that was a viable business as well as a deeply-held conviction. What is unusual in *Indian Opinion* is the extent to which Gandhi vocally defended these practices as intentional social experiments, rather than simply the strategies of survival.[45] As with much of Gandhi's politics, the production of *Indian Opinion* was informed by equal parts philosophical beliefs and the exigencies of material limitations. By putting *Indian Opinion* in conversation with other diasporic periodicals, however, one can see the financial and labor pressures informing Gandhi's decisions, pressures that were shared by many other small presses. Although the reproduction of material from other sources was often motivated by cost-cutting techniques, quotations were deliberately selected to bolster editors' conceptions of a united empire that transcended racial and national lines. As this chapter will show, cut-and-paste was both a practical response to the difficulties of producing an underfunded, understaffed paper *and* a creative invocation of an imperial ideal.

Reaching a Global Market, Sustaining a Local Paper: The politics and practice of production

Editors struggled between their desire to make their publications available to all classes and their need to make a living from the press. The languages in which the papers

[44] Ballantyne, "Reading," 50-1; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 23-4, 26; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 39.
[45] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, especially introduction.

were published, their circulation practices, and their subscription rates all evidence the creative ways in which editors navigated their political beliefs and the material restrictions of printing with little funding and labor.

The languages that these papers published in provide evidence of their intended audience and political vision. As multilingual publications, these journals were intended to organize and advocate for local Indian readers, but they were also designed to appeal to English speakers in the colony as well as in Britain.[46] In the *Sansar*, Singh wrote of himself, "Through the press and on the public platform he [Singh] is educating public opinion."[47] Although the Ghadr party had politics almost diametrically opposed to Singh, Ghadrites like Ram Chandra, Husain Rahim, and Taraknath Das nonetheless recognized the importance of appealing to non-Indian opinion in Canada, the US, and Britain. In one pamphlet published in 1923, Chandra argued that "'The Hindustan Gadar' considered it an imperative duty to place the truth regarding India before the people of the United States.'"[48] Rahim used the *Hindustanee* for a similar purpose in Canada, where he stated that the paper would "publish, for the first time, a review of the British system of colonization in Canada, and the position of Hindustanees as viewed by Hindustanees."[49] Aiyar originally intended to publish *African Chronicle* in Tamil only but "owing to repeated request, made by a good many of his readers to have part of this Journal in English as well, he has decided to accede to their request."[50] However, due to the time involved in publishing in two languages, he informed readers that "At present we propose

[46] Frost, "That Great Ocean," 253.
[47] "Dr. Sundar Singh: Editor of the 'Sansar'," *Sansar*, June 1914.
[48] Ram Chandra, *India Against Britain: A Reply to Austin Chamberlain Secretary of State for India, Lord Hardinge Former Viceroy of India, Lord Islington Under Secretary of State and Others* (San Francisco: [Hindustan Gadar, 1916?]), https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015065567334;view=1up;seq=3, 5-6.
[49] "Why Hindustanee is Monthly," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.
[50] Ourselves," *AC*, 27 June 1908.

to publish in the English columns a racy [sic] commentary on the current news of the week but for other items of general interest, the readers must look for it elsewhere .[51] When Aiyar converted the Tamil section to a daily newspaper, he retained the English section only as a weekly for another three months. In 1915, however, he declared,

> "The Success [which] followed the publication of this journal as a Daily Newspaper in the Tamil language, has created a demand for English columns…We propose to publish not less than one page of English reading matter…We firmly believe that the time is come for the self-governing colonies, especially her statesmen and the public press, to devote greater attention and closer study to problems touching our Indian Empire and it is with a view to afford facilities for this study, we venture to appear from to-day as a bilingual daily journal. If we succeed in causing a better understandieg [sic] between South Africa and India in however small proportion it may be, we feel, it worth while [sic] making some sacrifice."[52]

Aiyar determined to publish *African Chronicle* as an English weekly and then as an English daily, despite the strains of bilingual printing, because he believed that it would encourage "better understanding" between the different parts and peoples of the empire. This belief, or hope, was common to the editors examined here. Their multilingual printing reflected and expressed a commitment to transnational activism that was both imperial and diasporic.

Subscription rates, too, offer an indication of who the editors *wanted* to read their papers. Subscription rates, like linguistic choices, demonstrate editors' vision of their prospective audiences, in terms of class background and geographical location. *Ghadr*, which was produced by volunteers, was the only publication offered free of charge, a policy which reflected its radical politics. Because *Ghadr* was prohibited in many places, its distribution was clandestine, with the paper being smuggled in mislabeled packages or

[51] Ibid.
[52] Ourselves," *AC*, 20 May 1915.

individual pages enclosed in private correspondence.[53] Nonetheless, this did not prevent its global distribution, with issues reported in South and North America, Japan, Southeast Asia, Germany, southern and eastern Africa as well as India, particularly in the northwest.[54] *Ghadr* explicitly aimed at a working-class audience and its free distribution rate reflected this. *The Aryan* was also unusual in that it had no fixed subscription rates. Instead, the first issue stated, "Friends and others in sympathy with the Cause are requested to communicate with the Manager."[55] However, Sunder Singh's other paper, *The Sansar* had an annual subscription of $2.50 in January 1914, dropped to $2 in June 1914.[56] This was much more expensive than *The Hindustanee*'s annual rates of $1 for Canada, $1.50 for the US, Rs. 4.50 for India, and 6 shillings for England. In June 1914, the rate for India was reduced to Rs. 2.50.[57] Both the *Hindustanee* and *Sansar* provided free sample copies to entice readers to subscribe.[58] Published by Ghadrite Husain Rahim, the *Hindustanee,* while not circulated free of charge like *Ghadr,* was clearly intended to be more affordable than Singh's paper, which was directed more at white Canadians than at Indian readers.

South African papers offered price per issue as well as subscription rates. *Colonial Indian News*, *African Chronicle*, and *Indian Opinion* each cost 3d per issue,

---

[53] N. Gerald Barrier, *Banned: Controversial Literature and Political Control in British India, 1907-1947* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974), 39; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 44-6.
[54] Barrier, *Banned*, 36; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 2, 23, 47; Seema Sohi, *Echoes of Mutiny: Race, Surevillance and Indian Anticolonialism in North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 59-61, 160.
[55] *Aryan*, August 1911.
[56] *Sansar*, 5 January 1914; *Sansar*, June 1914.
[57] "Annual Subscriptions," *Hindustanee*, January 1914; "Annual Subscriptions," *Hindustanee*, June 1914; "Ourselves," *Hindustanee*, June 1914. "Ourselves" in the June issue stated the reduced price at Rs. 2.8 [sic] but the subscription prices listed it as Rs. 2.50.
[58] *Sansar*, January 1914; *Sansar*, June 1914; "Why Hindustanee is Monthly," *Hindustanee*, January 1914; "The Progress of 'The Hindustanee,'" *Hindustanee*, February 1914; *Hindustanee*, March 1914.

while *Indian Views* charged 3d. per paper or 4d. to include postage.[59] Aiyar's papers also offered quarterly or half-yearly payments which were usually slightly more than the yearly discounted subscription.[60] Yearly subscription rates for *Colonial Indian News* began at 11 shillings within Natal, but was increased after the first issue to 11s 6d., and again in January 1902 to 12s 6d. Six years later, Aiyar started *African Chronicle* at a reduced rate of 12 shillings per year within Natal. In 1910 Aiyar increased the Natal rate while decreasing subscriptions for readers outside Natal, offering a yearly subscription of 15 shillings whether in or out of the colony.[61] Aiyar made a point of keeping his subscription rates low. One of his critiques of the merchant-dominated Natal Indian Congress was that their subscription rates were too high for the younger, colonial-born generation to attend.[62] This is demonstrated by the fact that *Indian Opinion* started in 1903 at 15s 6d for readers in Natal, a price that was higher than Aiyar's paper even in 1914.[63] *Indian Views* matched *African Chronicle*, starting at 15s in 1914 for Natal readers.[64]

Subscription rates for those outside of Natal were higher, since editors had to calculate postage fees. Again, Aiyar showed a commitment to lower charges, although here the prices were closer to other presses. *Colonial Indian News*'s initial charge was 4s

[59] When *AC* became a daily, each issue cost 1d.
[60] "Rates of Subscription," *AC*, 10 October 1908; "African Chronicle: Rates of Subscription," *AC*, 15 April 1910; "Publisher's Notice," *AC*, 4 May 1912; "Subscription Rates," *CIN*, 18 May 1901; "Subscription Rates," *CIN*, 24 May 1901; "Subscription Rates," *CIN*, 24 January 1902.
[61] In 1912, Aiyar increased the half-yearly rate to 7s 6d while leaving the yearly and quarterly rates the same. Subscription rates do not occur in subsequent issues, although presumably there would have been some increase between 1912 and the paper's demise in 1921.
[62] "Durban News: From Our Own Correspondent," *CIN*, 28 June 1901.
[63] This was dropped to 14s for all South African readers in 1912, enabled by a drop in postage fees and the lighter weight of the paper due to advertisements having been dropped. In addition, Gandhi stated that he wanted the paper to have a wide readership and lowering the fee seemed the most expeditious way to accomplish this ("From the Editor's Chair: Our Subscription Rates," *IO*, 28 September 1912).
[64] *IV*, 24 July 1914.

quarterly outside Natal, increased in 1902 to 8s 6d for six months.[65] *Indian Opinion* started in 1903 at 17s yearly for readers beyond Natal, while *African Chronicle* charged 16s 9d yearly in 1908.[66] *African Chronicle* dropped its rates to 15s in 1910, as did *Indian opinion* in 1912.[67] *Indian Views*, in contrast, began in 1914 at 17s 6d yearly.[68] Subscription rates enumerate not only the prices but also the places where editors planned to sell their papers (see below). They therefore reflect at least the editors' ideas, if not the reality, of who their audience was.

Circulation likely remained limited to a small, elite, literate audience. Mesthrie points out that the literacy rate for South African Indians was only 12.9%.[69] It is extremely difficult to get precise circulation numbers of these papers. However, readership was likely small, as editors often complained of the lack of subscribers. Gandhi himself claimed that out of a possible audience of 20,000 readers *Indian Opinion* had only about 3,500 readers between 1907 and 1914.[70] Amongst the much smaller Canadian Indian population, Rahim deemed the *Hindustanee* financially secure for the next year with only 39 yearly subscriptions and a maintenance fund from about 20 people offering $1 to $2 per month.[71] However, papers were often read aloud and individual issues were passed amongst family and friends, so one purchase might be read or heard

[65] "Subscription Rates," *CIN*, 18 May 1901; Subscription Rates," *CIN*, 24 January 1902.
[66] *IO*, 4 June 1903; "Rates of Subscription," *AC*, 10 October 1908.
[67] "African Chronicle: Rates of Subscription," *AC*, 15 April 1910; "From the Editor's Chair: Our Subscription Rates," *IO*, 28 September 1912.
[68] *IV*, 24 July 1914.
[69] Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 104.
[70] Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 28. In 1905, *Indian Opinion* had double the number of any other weekly newspaper distributed house to house in Durban (Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 104).
[71] "Ourselves," *Hindustanee*, April 1914. The same article, however, stated that subscriptions from India were expected (and necessary) within the next year.

by many more people.[72] Correspondence columns offer a glimpse into the readership. From these letters, we know that, for instance, that *African Chronicle* was read in the Strait Settlement, Madras, and the US.[73] Nonetheless, readership must have been fairly small, if geographically, racially, and politically diverse.

Subscription rates reveal that regardless of reality of circulation rates, editors intended their papers to be read by a geographically diverse audience. It is striking that every paper except *Sansar* offered a subscription rate within their own colony and another beyond it, clearly indicating an intended audience beyond their immediate locality. While most papers simply offered a single price for "outside the colony," others specified places and rates, suggesting a clear vision of their proposed circulation. *African Chronicle* enumerated the Transvaal, Cape Colony, England, and India, while *The Hindustanee* listed subscription rates for Canada, the US, India, and England.[74] *Indian Opinion* initially offered a blanket charge outside of Natal, but after nine years of publication, it had a much clearer sense of its audience and could therefore confidently publish subscription rates for East Africa, Rhodesia, India, and England.[75] While not enumerating all of geographical locations of *IO*'s readers (see correspondence columns), this list must have represented the bulk of *the paper's* external readership. The case of *The Hindustanee* is particularly interesting. It offered prices in three different currencies, reflecting Rahim's intention to reach a British and Indian as well as a Canadian audience. The price in shillings is particularly important, since it reaffirms other statements by

[72] Vivek Bald, "Desertion and Sedition: Indian Seamen, Onshore Labor, and Expatriate Radicalism in New York and Detroit, 1914-1930," in *The Sun Never Sets: South Asian Migrants in an Age of U. S. Power*, eds. Vivek Bald, Miabi Chatterjee, Sujani Reddy, and Manu Vimalassery (New York: New York University, 2013), 92-3; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 41; "Mightier than the Sword," *AC*, 26 August 1911.
[73] Strait Settlement [pseud.], "Correspondence," *AC*, 13 March 1909; "Correspondence: An Appeal from America for National Education," *AC*, 15 May 1909; "South Indian Patriot's Letter," *AC*, 19 April 1912.
[74] "Rates of Subscription," *AC*, 10 October 1908; "Annual Subscriptions," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.
[75] "From the Editor's Chair: Our Subscription Rates," *IO*, 28 September 1912.

Rahim that *The Hindustanee* was intended to present the case of Canadian Indians to a sympathetic British audience. This is marked contrast with the Ghadr party's eponymous paper, which was circulated only amongst diasporic Indians and was only printed in Indian vernaculars. The subscription rates support other evidence that Rahim envisioned *The Hindustanee* as the Ghadr party's English outreach program or as a complementary program to do the kind of internal imperial reform that Ghadr's radical politics could not immediately effect. While most papers did not clearly delineate their reader networks in such a fashion, most of the editors clearly envisioned a circulation for their paper that went beyond the local or even the national.

Many editors struggled to get their subscribers to pay on time. Aiyar regularly announced to his readers that their subscriptions would be "strictly payable in advance" and that being in arrears would terminate their delivery, but the recurrence of this announcement suggests that his desperate financial straits did not permit him to enforce this policy.[76] Gandhi, too, suffered from late subscribers. Even in the article declaring that *Indian Opinion* had dropped their subscription rates in accordance with Gandhi's decision to "give…up the commercial side of our business—together with the income derived from it," the editor reminded readers that subscriptions were "strictly" payable in advance. The article further declared, "This has always been our rule, but there have been many exceptions, so many, in fact, that it has meant serious financial loss to this concern."[77] Despite—or because of—the fact that Gandhi had recently converted the press from a private business to a shared trust and had decided to stop having

[76] "Notice to Our Subscribers," *CIN*, 5 July 1901; "Publisher's Notice," *AC*, 28 November 1908, 20 November 1909, and 4 May 1912; "Notice," *AC*, 2 January 1909 and *AC*, 21 May 1910; *AC*, 27 April 1912; "Notice to Subscribers," *AC*, 15 February, 22 February, 1 March, 7 March, and 29 March 1913.
[77] "From the Editor's Chair: Our Subscription Rates," *IO*, 28 September 1912.

advertisements in the paper, the press (and its workers) was "dependent to a large extent upon the income from subscriptions." He therefore asked that "our readers, who value the paper and the work we are trying to do, will appreciate our position and send their subscriptions in advance."[78] In the second issue, The *Hindustanee* informed its readers that "Any recognition of 'The Hindustanee' made in the form of subs. [sic] will be highly appreciated…The Hindustanee shall continue to appear every calendar month until sufficient number of subscriptions are at hand to justify publication at shorter intervals… **The receipt of a sample copy of The Hindustanee is an invitation to subscribe**."[79] By the third issue, Rahim chastised his readers, "Subscriptions received during the last month were an insignificant number…No more sample copies will be mailed."[80] Unlike Aiyar, who requested that his readers buy more subscriptions rather than sharing a paper amongst several individuals or families, Singh was desperate enough to *ask* his readers to share *The Aryan*. "No good paper fulfills its purpose unless it is read by as many as possible. Pass this along to a friend."[81] A later issue simply enjoined readers, "READ THE ARYAN AND PASS IT ON TO YOUR FRIENDS."[82] Rahim also used this technique for the *Hindustanee*. Although he stopped offering free "invitation copies" after the first two issues, the third issue told readers to "**pass it on to your friends**."[83] Perhaps Singh and Rahim hoped that word of mouth and free readings would encourage people to eventually take out subscriptions for themselves.

---

[78] Ibid.
[79] The Progress of 'The Hindustanee,'" *The Hindustanee*, February 1914. This was repeated in "Ourselves," *The Hindustanee*, March 1914.
[80] "Ourselves," *The Hindustanee*, March 1914.
[81] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, July 1912. See also: "No good paper fulfills its purpose unless it is read by as many as possible. Pass this along to a friend. We will send you other literature if you want it" (*Aryan* June 1912).
[82] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, November 1912.
[83] *Hindustanee*, March and June 1914.

Complaints about the difficulty of publishing a paper on such short funds were frequent. At one point, Singh issued a sharply worded rebuke to his readers, pointing out the difficult and unrewarding labor involved in producing regular issues of the paper. "YOU may think it a snap to prepare the literary banquet which we dish up to our readers. If you do, you ought to just try it once and see how you come out. We work from morning till night, and midnight often catches us. We are willing to do it, certainly, and are proud of the opportunity to serve in this manner, but we ask your co-operation in the matter."[84] Aiyar wrote that, "While every Indian has more or less an idea of the value those papers are to the Cause, yet to our mind a large number do not realize…that there is a commercial side to such enterprise. Machinery, type, paper, trained compositors, etc. have to be provided and paid for and no paper can pay its way without adequate support."[85] These difficulties were especially challenging for editors in the colonies where print, ink, and paper had to be imported and even more so for editors who required type in multiple languages.[86]

Editors repeatedly emphasized to their readers that financial support from the community was necessary to the success of the papers, which in turn were fundamental to the achievement of political rights. After one year in business, Singh informed his readers, "WITH our backs to the wall, we are fighting YOUR fight. We want to win and we want your help. This task will be easier, very much easier if you lend a helping hand."[87] Similarly, in its first issue, *The Hindustanee* informed its readers that "The expenditure necessary for the maintenance of a newspaper must come from them. In

[84] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, August 1912.
[85] "Mightier than the Sword," *AC*, 26 August 1911.
[86] Ballantyne, "Reading," 52-4; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 103.
[87] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, July 1912.

order that the paper be placed on a self-supporting basis, not only Hindustanees [sic] of America, but our compatriots from Bharat are solicited to extend their monetary and literary support."[88] These papers were barely self-supporting, and were often subsidized by the editors' own savings or by donations.[89]

Due to financial difficulties, many of these editors ran printing presses that produced much more than their respective periodicals. Even before publishing *Indian Opinion*, the International Printing Press opened its doors in 1898 offering "Artistic and General" printing in Gujarati, Tamil, Hindi, Urdu, Marathi, Sanskrit, French, Dutch, Zulu, and Hebrew as well as English.[90] Later, *Indian Opinion* offered its diary for 1908 and 1909 gratis to subscribers as an incentive to pay on time; otherwise the diary cost 1s 1d.[91] Even when Aiyar was based in Pietermaritzburg, he established a Durban agent to take jobbing orders for his press as well as orders for *Colonial Indian News*.[92] Printing services included stationery materials for businesses, including but not limited to appointment books, business and visiting cards, menus, letterheads, circulars, receipt and delivery books, and promissory notes as well as stationery materials for community organizations including event programs, sermons, and hymns.[93] These jobs went some way towards defraying the cost of newspaper publication, but most editors still lived a precarious existence.

---

[88] "Editorial," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.
[89] See chapter four for more on funding disputes.
[90] Advertisement International Printing Press, *IO*, 4 June 1903; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 2, 5, 46; Pachai, "Indian Opinion," 28; Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 102.
[91] "Our Diary," *IO*, 28 December 1907; Advertisement for Indian Opinion Diary, *IO*, 30 January 1909; "Our Diary," *IO*, 13 November 1909. In 1910 the diary was offered for those who paid half a year's subscription ("Please Note," *IO*, 18 December 1909).
[92] "Notice," *CIN*, 5 July 1901.
[93] Advertisement for P. S. Aiyar "Commercial and General Printings," *CIN*, 31 May 1901; Advertisement International Printing Press, *IO*, 4 June 1903; Advertisement International Printing Press, *IO*, 21 November 1908; Advertisement for African Chronicle Printing Works, *AC,* 4 July 1908.

Activist printing presses also intermittently translated and/or printed important pamphlets or articles originally published elsewhere. *Ghadr* printed pamphlets in English and vernaculars as well as a series of workers' poetry called *Ghadar-di-Gunj* (Echoes of Revolt).[94] The International Printing Press printed political and philosophical pamphlets including Annie Besant's translation of the Bhagavad Gita, Henry David Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience*, Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*, and Leo Tolstoy's "Letter to a Hindu."[95] Presses also sometimes served as intermediaries or distributors for other presses, as when *Indian Opinion* undertook to collect subscriptions for Reverend Joseph J. Doke's book *M. K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa* so that the publishers would know how many copies to print for South Africa.[96] Other printing projects required subscribers to pay in advance, for the printing press could not afford the material and labor required unless they were guaranteed payment, as was the case with Henry Salomon Leon Polak's pamphlet on the passive resistance movement. *Indian Opinion* also required that subscribers pay the cost of postage.[97] These publications, like the newspapers, were both an opportunity to raise more money and an articulation of editors' politics.

The publication of these papers was an act of love and of faith, a clear statement of the importance of political activism at the cost of one's wealth, and in Aiyar's case,

---

[94] Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 40-1.

[95] Advertisement, *IO*, 14 January 1905; Facts and Comments," *IO*, 23 September 1905; "The Publication of 'Indian Home Rule': English Translation of the Gujarati work, 'Hind Swaraj,' Proscribed by the Indian Government," *IO*, 2 April 1910; "Tolstoy's Letter to a Hindoo," *AC*, 2 April 1910; Hofmeyr, "Lives and Letters," 22-3; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, chapters four and five.

[96] "An Interesting Episode," *IO*, 22 May 1909; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 118. Reverend Doke's biography of Gandhi was to be "well printed on good paper, illustrated, and bound in good cloth covers" and the proceeds were donated to publicity for the passive resistance movement ("'M. K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South Africa': A Forthcoming Book," *IO*, 22 May 1909).

[97] "Asiatic Passive Resistance," *IO*, 18 April, 25 April, 2 May, 9 May and 18 July 1908. When publication was postponed with the renewal of the passive resistance movement, subscribers were offered a choice of a return of their money or a copy of Doke's autobiography of Gandhi, Polak's previous pamphlet, "The Indians of South Africa," and a shillings worth of International Press publications, or six shillings worth of International Press publications, shipping costs included. Given that Polak's book cost only 5 shillings per subscription, this seems like a generous offer ("'Asiatic Passive Resistance,'" *IO*, 1 January 1910).

health. Editors suffered from constant shortages of labor and funding.[98] Despite this, they struggled to produce their papers regularly and to include news, information, and advice meant to be of service to the community. In doing so, editors sought ways to produce more with less. Cut-and-paste journalism was a crucial tool for editors struggling with a small budget and less labor.[99]

Cut-and-paste: networks of newsprint

The most prominent of these coping strategies was cut-and-paste techniques. Editors would crib material from other, larger papers, either using them for summary information, quoting from articles, or often reproducing them wholesale. While this was usually acknowledged (article leaders might indicate "from the *Times*"), material was sometimes reproduced without any attribution at all. Quotation marks were used inconsistently. Despite being common practice at the time, the effect of this was to create a sense of a singular voice emerging through the publication, a voice that was representative of imperial Indian opinion. Although these techniques were obviously used to defray costs, I argue that the editors used them to serve a political as well as a practical purpose. Editors deliberately reproduced articles from three main sources: British, Indian, and colonial papers, supplemented by local, national, and imperial government documents. Together, these sources expressed editors' visions of a united empire. Even when reprinting articles that disagreed with their politics, editors interpolated them in such a way as to engage the original source material in a conversation that was presented

[98] Typographical errors were common due to labor shortages and appear to increase during times of heightened labor or editors' illness. For this reason, I have left the frequent typos in place in order to indicate the difficulty of the labor involved in these productions.
[99] Ballantyne, "Reading," 50-1.

as evidence of what many editors called the "True Imperialism."[100] Editors not only defended imperial citizenship explicitly in their texts, they implicitly exemplified it through the material production of the newspaper.

Diasporic Indian periodicals cited articles from local white settler newspapers, but almost as frequently summarized, quoted, or reproduced wholesale articles from British and Indian newspapers, as well as newspapers and Reuters reports from around the empire. Hofmeyr argues that reading and writing habits inculcated by diasporic periodicals were fundamental components of learning to be imperial citizens. "Since the ideal reader was an imperial citizen, he or she would have been accustomed to reading within the time-space continuum of empire, a skill in part built up through regularly negotiating the textual weave of exchange papers."[101] From Bombay to Rangoon to Victoria to Durban, letters, telegrams, speeches, and articles created a web of imperial language circulating through imperial space and amongst imperial citizens. London was a key node in this web, but it was only one node amongst many. These activist periodicals and their production, circulation, and reproduction were instrumental in creating awareness of Indian immigration and imperial citizenship as an imperial problem. At the same time, these reproductions were intended not only to convey news, but also to create a sense of imperial geography, of a shared sphere of information and activism.

News articles relating to Indian immigration or imperial citizenship emphasized the urgency and globality of the problem. Merely the names of English, Scottish, Bengali, Tamil, South African, and Canadian newspapers all reporting on the same issues conjured

[100] "True Imperialism," *IO*, 2 July 1903; Mohamed Ali (editor of *The Delhi Comrade*), quoted in *Manchester Guardian*, quoted in "Notes and News," *India*, 5 December 1913; *The Witness*, quoted in "An Act of Grace," *Aryan*, July 1912.
[101] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 86.

up an empire of concerned citizens all focused on the same problem. The meaning of these citations, however, differed depending on the source material. White colonial newspapers were most often used simply to provide information on local anti-Asiatic political movements and government measures.[102] They were also sometimes quoted in order to show the depth of anti-Asian prejudice. For instance, the *Aryan* quoted the horrifyingly racist *Vancouver Sunset*'s description of Indian immigrants as "'innumerable spawn which the hellmuck [sic] of India has produced'" and expostulated, "India National Congressmen please note these facts."[103] This quotation was subsequently used in a Bombay memorial to the Viceroy, which was itself quoted in both Aiyar and Gandhi's South African papers.[104] Activist-editors were dedicated to exposing the racism and ignorance of white colonial settlers at home and abroad.

While white colonial sources were most often reprinted in order to better criticize them, British and Indian newspapers were more frequently cited in order to demonstrate widespread support for Indian immigrants. By selecting newspaper articles from across the subcontinent, activists in South Africa and Canada bolstered their argument that the problem of immigration restriction was not a local or a communal concern, but one that mobilized Indian national opinion. Of particular interest were articles in which Anglo-Indian newspapers supported diasporic activists.[105] These articles were used to prove that "The Indian question in South Africa is one of the few questions which are totally above

[102] See chapter four for more on press coverage of government documents.
[103] *Vancouver Sunset*, "News and Notes," *Aryan*, June 1912.
[104] *Vancouver Sunset*, quoted in Bombay memorial to the Viceroy (1 August 1912), quoted in "An Appeal to the Viceroy (cont'd)," *IO*, 19 October 1912; *Vancouver Sunset*, quoted in Bombay memorial, quoted in "Indians in Colonies: A Strong Memorial: Canada," *AC*, 28 September 1912.
[105] Anglo-Indian [pseud.], *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in "The Asiatic Problem: Plea for a Compromise," *IO*, 6 May 1905; *Times of India, Bombay Gazette, Indu of Bombay, Gujarati Punch,* and *The Empire* quoted in "The Anglo-Indian and Indian Press on the Transvaal Deportations," *IO*, 24 September 1910; *The Empire* (Calcutta), quoted in "An Anglo-Indian tribute: To the Brave Transvaal Indians," *IO*, 15 July 1911.

party politics and about which there is no difference of opinion between the powerful Anglo-Indian element and the Congress."[106] Although at other times Anglo-Indian newspapers were subject to the same criticisms of parochialism and prejudice as white colonial sources,[107] when they supported diasporic Indian activism, they were deemed to be important proof of the dangerous nature of colonial anti-Indian legislation.

British newspapers carried a special cachet. Representing the opinion and the power of the metropole, quotations from British papers carried special cultural and political resonance. For the *African Chronicle*, the claims of the *Times* had such power that it was worth republishing in 1908 an article from 1896. According to *African Chronicle*,

> "what was stated then is as true and as applicable to-day as it was suitable in 1896. The article says that 'Indian government and the Indians themselves believe that it is in South Africa that this question of their status must be determined, if they secure the position of British subjects in South Africa, it will be almost impossible to deny it to them elsewhere. If they fail to secure that position in South Africa it will be extremely difficult for them to attain it elsewhere.'"[108]

The authority of the *Times* was invoked to bolster Indian claims that immigration restriction was a global rather than a local problem and to encourage reluctant South African Indians to fight, not only for their rights, but also for the rights of Indians in distant locations. The importance of the issue was measured not only through the quality of words published on this subject, but also through the quantity. Editors emphasized when British newspapers carried "leading articles" on the problems of overseas Indians

---

[106] "The National Congress and Indians in South Africa," *IO*, 19 November 1903.
[107] "'Anglo-Indian' on the British Indians in South Africa," *IO*, 3 December 1904; "An Anglo-Indian's View of the Asiatic question," *CIN*, 10 January 1902; "The Ten Commandments: From the Anglo-Indian Pulpit," *AC*, 28 November 1908.
[108] "All is Over: What is Next?, AC, 22 August 1908. This claim was echoed by a number of other British and Indian authorities. See for example: Sir Charles Bruce, in *Empire Review*, quoted in "Sir Charles Bruce on the Transvaal Crisis," *AC*, 7 November 1908.

or detailed exactly how many pages or columns such articles took up.[109] *Indian Opinion*'s London correspondent wrote that

> "the treatment of British Indian subjects by the Union Government of South Africa has been the dominant topic of the week. It has had the prominent position in daily newspapers; it has been the subject of innumerable 'leading articles,'…not to mention cables several times a day, and in frequent cases the monopoly of the content bills of the newspapers, especially the evening ones…I am almost 'snowed under' by newspaper articles on the subject; I make a selection, and forward them for the editor's use."[110]

Particularly during the prolonged passive resistance movement, this evidence of support bolstered local readers' activism.

These citations added strength to local protests by putting imperial, and specifically metropolitan, pressure on colonial politicians. During the *Komagata Maru*'s journey, *Indian Emigrant*, a paper published out of Madras, reported that "The Press both at Home and in India have been lashed into a fury of righteous indignation at what is now known as the Komagata Maru affair."[111] Strikingly, a Madrassi journal referred to the British press as "Home," indicating how thoroughly British and imperial identities were merged. Indian activists used the authority of the metropole to reinforce their opposition to colonial racism. As chapters two and three will discuss in more detail, the invocation of British authority was not simply a political move. It also had cultural and even racial valences, as Indian activists argued that they had a better understanding and appreciation of British values than white colonial settlers.

Geographies of reading: Publications across the empire

---

[109] *Pall Mall Gazette*, quoted in *S. A. News*, quoted in "Cowardly Desertion," *IO*, 14 September 1907; *Yorkshire Post,* quoted in "The Policy of Pacification: 'The Yorkshire Post' on the Transvaal Situation," *IO*, 15 May 1909; *Westminster Gazette,* quoted in "Opinion in England," *IO*, 12 November 1913.
[110] 21 November 1913, "Our London Letter," *IO*, 14 January 1914.
[111] "Notes and Comments: Moral of the Komagata Maru," *Indian Emigrant*, November 1914.

Periodicals frequently carried news items or advertisements on recently published books on topics of interest, which might include religion or vegetarianism in addition to Indian nationalism and imperial federation. This was common amongst colonial newspapers, which were "the fundamental infrastructure for intellectual life."[112] In colonial outposts far from the metropole, settlers created vibrant intellectual communities through the circulation, citation, and advertisement of material printed both locally and across the globe.[113] Some of these notices were solicited, as in the case of advertisements, or when a new newspaper editor sent out complimentary copies for review.[114] Such was the case in an *African Chronicle* article on the publications of Natesan & Co. in Madras. Aiyar began by acknowledging "with thanks the April and May numbers of the Indian Review." He praised the *Indian Review* as an "excellent magazine" and suggested that "our countrymen in South Africa owe a deep debt of gratitude for Mr. Natesan, the worthy Editor of this journal, who has done as much for our cause in South Africa as Mr. Gandhi has done…month and [sic] after month the pages of the Indian Review bear eloquent testimony to what he has been doing for our compatriots in South Africa." The same article noted "the receipt of a copy of congress and conferences a book that bristles with the progress of movements and a activites [sic] that have taken place during the last year in India. It costs only one shilling per copy, and we would strongly recommend this book for our reader's attention."[115] As in this article, review and advertisement often merged together seamlessly, as editors promoted and encouraged each other's work as

[112] Ballantyne, "Reading," 57. See also: Hofmeyr, "Lives and Letters," 22-3.
[113] Frost, "That Great Ocean," 274; Potter, *News*, 160; Hofmeyr, "Lives and Letters," 12; Hofmeyr et al., "Print Cultures," 7; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 49, 73-4.
[114] "Correspondence: An Appeal from America for National Education," *AC*, 15 May 1909; "A Review of 'The Hindustanee [sic] Student'" *Hindustanee*, April 1914; "Madras Congress and Conferences," *IO*, 6 March 1909.
[115] "Messrs. Natesan & Co's Publications," *AC*, 15 July 1911.

fellow printers and activists. Several times, *Indian Opinion* responded to readers with the address of a publisher and the prices of requested readings.[116] Other notices were the result of editors' own prolific reading habits and idiosyncratic interests, as in the case of a *Colonial Indian News* article which advertised, "A very curious and interesting and extraordinary novel—tracing the lineal descendancy [sic] of a superhuman hero will be published in the New Year. Only a limited number of copies will be printed. Book immediately for the copies."[117] Such notices encouraged further reading by newspaper consumers, either for entertainment or edification, particularly on topics relating to the Indian subcontinent.[118]

Editors would excerpt from books in order to more widely disseminate political views that they supported. The concept of copyright, where it existed, was often disregarded by the small-scale publishing world of periodicals, pamphlets, and book-magazines.[119] Gandhi, for instance, reproduced (with or without the author's permission) from Leo Tolstoy, Henry David Thoreau and Annie Besant.[120] Hofmeyr argues that "Gandhi's printing policies certainly conform to these principles but push them even further, seeing to move the marketplace entirely."[121] What Gandhi defended as a principle, other editors practiced as a matter of course in order to more cheaply and efficiently educate readers in their own political ideologies. *Ghadr*, for instance, reprinted

[116] "Correspondence: Answers to Correspondents," *IO*, 28 July 1906; "Correspondence," *IO*, 21 August 1909.
[117] "Will Shortly be Published," *CIN*, 20 September 1901.
[118] "A Timely Publication," *AC*, 26 October 1912; "A Review of the Yugantar of last month," *Ghadr*, translation enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1; "Review of Books and magazines," *AC*, 12 December 1908; "Books You Should Read," *IO*, 18 March 1905; "Autumn Announcements in the Book Trade: By Our London Correspondent," *IO*, 2 November 1907; "Indian Publications," *IO*, 2 September 1911; "News and Notes," *Aryan*, August 1912.
[119] Isabel Hofmeyr, "Violent Texts, Vulnerable Readers: *Hind Swaraj* and its South African Audiences," *Public Culture* 23, no. 2 (2011): 292.
[120] Hofmeyr, "Lives and Letters," 22; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 67, 94-5, 9, 103-5, 155-7.
[121] Hofmeyr, "Violent Texts," 293.

chapters from B. Savarkar's *History of the Mutiny of 1857*, publicizing the work of a famous radical nationalist while also offering implicit instruction to their readers on how to prepare for the second Ghadr (Mutiny).[122] In contrast, *India*, the organ of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, reprinted a review of William Wedderburn's biography of Allan Octavia Hume, using two white British founders of the INC to propagate their own vision of Indian nationalism developed along gradualist lines in amity with Britons.[123]

Notices of publications in India could also be used to emphasize the importance of India to the British empire. Reports on Indian nationalist biographies, for instance, might appear alongside those of British politicians, framing both Indian and British statesmen as key imperialists.[124] These reviews and advertisements often brought together books from disparate places, imagining new geographies that reflected the emotional and political centers of diasporic life. One issue of the *Aryan*, for example, advertised the *Christian Commonwealth*, published in London, *The Dawn Magazine: A High-class Monthly Devoted to Indian Civilization and Culture*, printed in Calcutta, *Unity*, a religious weekly from Chicago, and the Grain Growers' Guide of Winnipeg, Manitoba.[125] Each of these publications was from a different corner of the globe, yet they were also from places to which Canadian Indians might have special ties. Notices on recently published material expanded the empire beyond England, incorporating and even centering India as a key part of this imperial print culture.

---

[122] B. Savarkar, *History of the Indian Mutiny*, chapter three, quoted in "The History of the Mutiny of 1857," *Ghadr*, translation enclosed in Reid to Stevens, December 1913, VCA, H. H. Stevens Papers, 509-D-7 file 1.
[123] *Nation*, quoted in "Mr. Hume and the Congress: (From the 'Nation')," *India*, 8 August 1913.
[124] "Books to Buy Concerning India", *India*, 4 July 1913.
[125] *Aryan*, November 1912.

Empire by quotation: imagining an Anglo-Indian empire through promises and print

In addition to newspapers and government documents, activists and editors alike quoted from other British, Indian, and imperial sources. Historic speeches, books, and poetry were all employed, as the distinction between politics and literature was diffused into a generalized invocation of Britishness. Quotations from British sources, whether politicians' speeches or William Shakespeare's plays, evidenced activists' immersion in British culture and their educational credentials.[126] The invocation of important political and cultural British texts was part of a strategy of evincing Indians' qualifications for imperial citizenship. In summoning Queen Victoria and Charles Dickens in defense of Indian immigration, editors and activists evoked an imperial geography and imperial patriotism in which they, rather than white colonial settlers, were the proper inheritors of British culture and rights.

Activists relied heavily on political declarations made by British statesmen and monarchs—both historical and contemporary—in distinguishing between what they characterized as the "true imperialism" and the malevolent empire of racial divisions. Speeches like Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858, which promised benevolent treatment and religious toleration for Indian subjects or statements by British politicians including Lord Salisbury, Lord Selborne, and Lord Lansdowne about Indian treatment in South Africa were reproduced or referenced in petitions, public meetings, pamphlets, and periodicals.[127] In both Canada and South Africa, colonial officials were accused of

---

[126] Simon Gikandi, *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), xiii; Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), especially chapter six; Robert Darnton, "Literary Surveillance in the British Raj: The Contradictions of Liberal Imperialism," *Book History*, 4 (2001): 156.

[127] For Queen Victoria's Proclamation, see below. Selborne, Lansdowne, and Joseph Chamberlain quoted in Bruce, *British Indians*, 4-5; Selborne and Lansdowne quoted by Chairman of Nyasaland Indians, quoted

breaking promises made by earlier ministries.[128] More recent declarations could be used to embarrass politicians with their own hypocrisy, as in 1903 when Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree confronted Joseph Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with his own words six years earlier in defense of Indians.[129]

These declarations were often cited together in long chains, imagining a version of British imperialism that was centered on protection for Indians and racial equality. Selborne's statement on the eve of the Boer war itself referenced Queen Victoria's Proclamation, thus creating an intratextual chain of promises that mirrored Indians' extratextual connections between disparate imperial promises and historical moments.[130] In a Natal Indian Patriotic Union petition, reprinted in *African Chronicle*, South African Indian passive resisters quoted no less than six British statesmen:

> "'Lord Lytlon [sic] in 1877 said:—But you the natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed have a recognised claim to share largely with your English fellow subjects. Mr. Gladstone said:—It will not do for us to treat with contempt or even indifference this great people. Lord Ripon in 1882 said:—My study of History has led me to the conclusion that a great Empire is permanently maintained by the

---

in "Nyasaland and the Transvaal: Then and Now: Special to Indian Opinion," *IO*, 24 April 1909; Chamberlain and Salisbury quoted in "Forgotten Pledges," *IV*, 22 December 1916.

[128] "The Immigrants Bill: Mass Meeting of Indian Residents," in *Natal Advertiser*, quoted in *AC,* 1 April 1911; Gandhi to Mr. Chamney (26 May 1908), quoted in "Playing Foul: An Exhibition of Slimness [sic]: Transvaal Government and the Asiatic Act: Passive Resistance Once More," *IO*, 30 May 1908; mass meeting resolution, quoted in telegram from Kimberley and Beaconsfield Indians to Gladstone (Governor General South Africa), 7 May 1913, SAB GG LEER Volume 895 folder 15/400; Daljit Singh to Malcolm Reid, 11/6/14, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 2; mass meeting resolutions (27 May 1912), enclosed in Sri Guru Singh Sabha (Lahore) to Governor General (Canada), 11 August 1912, LAC RG25, Volume 1118, File. No. 66-C, R219-100-6-E. By 1914, the accusations of broken promises had become such a contentious issue that Smuts refused to conduct any conversations with Gandhi over the phone, insisting that everything be in writing (telegram CONFIDENTIAL from Governor General (South Africa) to Secretary of State for the Colonies [henceforth SSC], 29 December 1913, SAB GG LEER Volume 898, Ref 15/611).

[129] Chamberlain (1897), quoted in Bhownaggree to Chamberlain, September 15, 1903, *Transvaal Correspondence relating to the Position of British Indians in the Transvaal (*London: Darling and Son, Ltd., Her Majesty's Stationery Office, August 1904) Cd. 2239, BL/IOR/L/PARL/2/371.

[130] " 'Was it, or was it not our duty to see that our dusky fellow-subjects in the Transvaal, where they had a perfect right to go, should be treated as the Queen in our name had promised they should be treated… Was it [British Gov] going to see that the British subject wherever he went all over the world, whether he were white or black, was to have the rights which his Queen had secured for him?'" (Selborne quoted in Charles Bruce, *British Indians*, 4-5).

> righteousness of her laws, by her respect for the principles of justice. Queen Victoria! We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligation of duty which binds us to all our other subjects…King Edward VII. I shall endeavour to follow the great example of the first Queen Empress to work for the well-being of my Indian subjects of all ranks, and to merit as she did, their unfailing loyalty and affection. Lord Rippon [sic] in one of his despatches, writing to the Governor of Natal says: "It is the desire of Her Majesty's government that the Queen's Indian subjects shall be treated upon a footing of equality with all Her Majesty's other subjects."""[131]

The repetition, through the circulation and re-circulation of a core set of quotations, in print and oral political culture, not only created a common vocabulary with which to discuss immigration restriction, it also reinforced these quotations as a shorthand for imperialism. Through this constant re-iteration, the declarations acquired a cultural value far beyond their initial political meaning. Eventually, the statements were so well known they no longer needed to be quoted in full; a simple mention evoked claims of imperial glory and equality of citizenship. Quoting or referencing one "promise" was enough to conjure up a host of other related proclamations.

The most frequently referenced quotation was Queen Victoria's Proclamation in which she stated, "We hold ourselves bound to the native of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects" and declared that no discrimination against Indian subjects would be made on the grounds of creed, caste, or color.[132] This was frequently invoked to demonstrate that British imperial citizenship applied regardless of racial difference. Although this Proclamation made no mention of overseas Indians or imperial citizenship, Indian activists believed that it applied beyond

[131] "Mass Meeting: Petition to the Throne," *AC*, 12 September 1908.
[132] Quoted by G. Parameswaran Pillai, "The Status of British Indians Abroad: By G. Parameswaran Pillai Esq., B. A.: (*From the Indian Politics*)," quoted in *CIN,* 19 July 1901; quoted in G. P. Pillay lecture in Madras, quoted in *Norwood Press and Dulwick Advertiser*, quoted in "Indians as British Subjects," *CIN,* 14 June 1901; Naoroji to SSI, March 20, 1906, CO 291/90, Transvaal no. 11123.

the Raj. The centrality of the proclamation to Indians' claims of imperial citizenship is demonstrated by the fact that it was frequently referred to as "the Indians' Magna Carta."[133] Part of this proclamation formed the masthead of the *Aryan* and was featured prominently in several other publications.[134] In a speech before Parliament, Ampthill remarked that Indians were "constantly referring" to the Proclamation,[135] but, nonetheless he felt sure "Your Lordships will forgive me if I quote that oft-quoted pledge once more.'"[136]

Although government officials sometimes argued that these promises were out of date or irrelevant beyond their immediate geographic area (i.e. that Queen Victoria's Proclamation applied only within the subcontinent), Indians by and large rejected this premise.[137] Instead, they interpreted imperial promises as at once rooted in a historical moment and as timeless. As Gandhi said,

> "'We are not dealing with promises that were made fifty years ago, though we undoubtedly rely upon the proclamation of 1858 as our 'Magna Charta.' That proclamation has been reaffirmed more than once. Viceroy after Viceroy has stated emphatically that it was a promise acted upon…These are matters not of years gone by but of recent years.'"[138]

---

[133] "Magna Charta of our Rights and Liberties: Queen Victoria's Instructions to Lord Derby," *AC*, 13 October 1908; British Indians in Cape Town to SSI, n.d. [received 23/3/1905], IOR/L/PJ/713, File 753; Ampthill, at United Empire Club January 28, quoted in "Lord Ampthill and His Party: The Speech," *India*, 6 February 1914; "From the Editor's Chair: Indians in Australia," *IO*, 23 April 1910; United India League and Khalsa Diwan petition to Ottawa, quoted in Isabella Ross Broad, *An Appeal for Fair Play for the Sikhs in Canada* (1913).

[134] *Aryan*, September 1911; "Magna Charta of our Rights and Liberties," *AC*, 3 October 1908.

[135] Ampthill, quoted in "Imperial Parliament: House of Lords: British Indians in South Africa," *IO*, 3 September 1910.

[136] "Lord Ampthill's Speech: In the House of Lords: Verbatim Report," *IO*, 9 May 1909.

[137] Arthur Lawley (Lieutenant Governor Pretoria) to Lord Alfred Milner (High Commissioner Transvaal), 13 April 1904, National Archives Repository (Public Records of Transvaal Province) [henceforth TAB] GOV LEER Volume 662, REF 15/04; "The Colour Question in the Colonies," *AC*, 9 September 1911. Edward Nundy, a South African Indian, made a rare concession, agreeing with white settlers that "India should give up harping upon these pledges and declarations" because in 1857 Victoria couldn't have foreseen the current Colonial sentiment (Edward Nundy, *The Transvaal Asiatic Ordinance, 1907: An Exposure* (Johannesburg: The Transvaal Leader, 1907), 35).

[138] Gandhi, "Lord Selborne and British Indians in the Transvaal," *IO*, 9 December 1905. See also: "I remembered in a flash all the Imperial promises that had been made to India, I remembered the promises that had been made through the old East India Company, the late Queen's proclamation, the King-

These statements imagined a chronology of British imperial liberalism, of promises constantly renewed between the British government and the Indian people. The iteration and reiteration of these promises formed both a textual monument to British imperial honor and a reprimand to those colonists who would threaten the empire and betray their nation by denying these promises.

In citing these documents, activists played with the many meanings of the word "constitution," referring both to a founding political document (which Britain did not in fact have)[139] and the physical and psychological characteristics of an individual.[140] Nations as well as individuals were believed to have constitutions, which were understood to be determined by inheritance as well as an environment. While operating at one level as a political critique of racist legislation's perceived illegality, the term "constitution" also implicitly contrasted white settlers' un-British behavior with a true Briton's mental and moral makeup. This double meaning associated justice and racial equality with the inherent racial or national characteristics of Britons. In reminding British imperialists of these promises, Indian editors interpolated themselves into the center of a traditional narrative of British imperial power based on justice and fair play. Aiyar claimed that an anti-Asiatic Licensing Bill

---

Emperor's message to the Delhi Durban [sic]" (Polak, quoted in "The Mass Meeting: European Sympathy: From Our Transvaal Representative," *IO*, 11 January 1908).

[139] Aiyar even referred to the "unwritten and written laws of the British constitution" ignoring the fact that there was no written British constitution, although *IO* described the British constitution as "that curious agglomeration of strange uses and customs" ("Notes & Comments," *AC*, 31 October 1908; "A Model Citizen: A Review," *IO*, 1 February 1908). Later, Aiyar declared that the "British Empire…has an unwritten constitution, political traditions and a code of ethics common to all British subjects irrespective of colour or decree" (P. Subramania Aiyar, *The Indian Problem in South Africa*, with an introduction by Harold J. Stuart (Durban: African Chronicle Printing Works, 1925).

[140] L. Gabriel, quoted in "Mass Meeting: Petition to the Throne," *AC*, 12 September 1908; Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, quoted in "Sir William Wedderburn and the East India Association: Special Report," *IO*, 16 July 1903; Gandhi, quoted in "Lord Selborne and British Indians in the Transvaal," *IO*, 9 December 1905.

> "undermine[d] those noble and admirable traditions, and justice of Anglo-Saxon Institutions, nay, principles that impeach British History, British Glory, and everything British… Indians, as His Magesty's [sic] devoted, loyal subjects, are in solemn duty bound to uphold the rights of a constitution, which has been handed down to us since time immemorial, and which our countrymen, despite the small encroachments made upon our rights in a random fashion, have all along kept up their traditions."[141]

This quotation inserted diasporic Indians into the pre-history of the British nation—"from time immemorial"—identifying Indians as an "us" that transcended the traditional temporal, geographic, and racial boundaries of the British nation. Positioning themselves as the custodians of British tradition, Indians became the caretakers of the empire and the true Britons, while racist British politicians and colonial settlers became un-British threats to the empire.

Politicians and monarchs were not the only sources that editors availed themselves of. Citations from British literature offered further proof of Indians' cultural literacy and familiarity with British mores. Aiyar quoted a William Cowper poem about the newspaper in the first issue of *Colonial Indian News*, as part of a larger editorial defending the newspaper as a beacon of democracy and civilization.[142] Casual references to and quotations from works by Jane Austen, William Shakespeare, Charles Dickens, and Lewis Carroll evidenced the speaker's immersion in British culture and the depth of their English language education.[143] In criticizing Gandhi's prolixity, *Indian Views* repeatedly referred to him as a "Boswell" and as "fop Brummell."[144] When the NIA

[141] "Retaliate! Retaliate!" *AC*, 1 August 1908.
[142] "The Newspaper Press," *Aryan*, 18 May 1901.
[143] Cleric, "Correspondence: What's in a Name?," *AC*, 20 February 1909; Teja Singh, "'Tis a Destiny that Shapes our Ends Rough Hew them How We Will," *Aryan,* February 1912; "Plea for Transferring Jurisdiction on Immigration Matters to Duly Constituted Courts of Justice," *Hindustanee*, 1 January 1914; "Will India Retaliate?" *IO*, 12 July 1913; "Shameless Misrepresentations," *IO,* 8 May 1909; "Pride and Prejudice," *IO,* 10 November 1906.
[144] Our Ethical Contemporary," *IV*, 20 November 1914; "A Second Course," *IV*, 25 December 1914; *IV*, 11 December 1914.

broke from the NIC at Gandhi's instigation, Anglia wrote that the NIA "for bombast and conceit compares not unfavourably with the famous 'Three tailors of Tooley Street'!"[145] This referred to an apocryphal petition signed by only three men but beginning "We, the people of England" and was part of British political lore used to discredit those who falsely claimed to represent a population. At the start of the passive resistance movement, Hassan Dawad, a South African Indian studying for the Bar in London, quoted from another Cowper poem about abolitionism: "'Slaves cannot breathe in England'… Of course we are not slaves—but we are treated worse than slaves by this Government."[146] Dawad used Cowper's poem to underscore his familiarity with English literature and culture, but also to shame the Transvaal government, who, he implicitly argued, were violating a British heritage of freedom that Indians understood better than Afrikaners. Quotations from British authors served a double purpose: to demonstrate activists' literacy (and thereby their fitness for citizenship) and to use British sources to criticize colonial racism as un-British.

Occasionally, however, British authors were cited so that editors could disagree with their message. Rudyard Kipling was particularly unpopular with Indian activists, who often followed Kipling quotations with arguments and facts intended to disprove their fallacy. *Indian Opinion* lamented that "The 'white man's burden' has been sung by Kipling. But the brown man's burden has yet to be wept over."[147] According to *Indian Opinion*, "perhaps it should read, not the burden borne by the white man, but the burden of the white man borne by the non-white."[148] These critiques ridiculed the racist, coercive

[145] "The Farewell Letter," *IV*, 24 July 1914.
[146] Hassan Dawad, "'The Flag of Injustice'" *IO*, 10 October 1908; reprinted in *AC*, 17 October 1908.
[147] "Savage!" *IO*, 12 September 1908.
[148] "The White Man's burden," *IO*, 17 April 1909.

empire of Kipling or white colonists, which Gandhi and others believed belied the "true empire" of fair play manifested in Queen Victoria's Proclamation or Cowper's poetry.

Diasporic editors especially objected to Kipling's claim that "'East is east and west is west, never the twain shall meet.'" *The Hindustanee* called it a "specific" invented by a "quack". "This mental chloroform," *The Hindustanee* warned, "when administered, is found to act as all other narcotics do. The patient for a time feels exhilarated and stimulated, but reaction soon sets in and men treated with this dope are left miserable mental cripples."[149] Depicting Britain as an enfeebled, drug-addled body politic, Rahim played on contemporary anxieties about British racial degeneration in order to argue that politics of racial exclusion endangered the British empire. On another occasion, Rahim's criticisms of Kipling were more explicitly anti-colonial, linking Kipling's imperialism to the end of the British empire. He wrote, "Bards like Rudyard Kipling…exulted in hypnotyzing [sic] the British to believe that the Britishers were a wonderful race…Hero-worship has its concomitant, assassination, as the history of mankind has recorded in every land and community…So the Czars and assassins go hand in hand."[150] Comparing the British Raj to the autocratic Russian czar, Rahim defended both Russian and Indian revolutionaries who were using violence to overthrow an oppressive rule. In Rahim's view, it was imperialists like Kipling who were ultimately responsible for that violence, rather than the revolutionaries themselves. More loyalist activists praised Indian

[149] "A Specific," *Hindustanee*, January 1914. *Indian Opinion* also called this quotation the "quack imperialism of Kipling" ("The White Man's burden," *IO*, 17 April 1909). On another occasion *Indian Opinion* celebrated the Universal Races Congress as evidence that "Kipling must eat his own words, for the East and West have met" ("A Parliament of Men: The Great Universal Races Congress Held in London," *IO*, 26 August 1911). See also: *Transvaal Leader*, quoted in "Johannesburg's Farewell Banquet," *IO*, 22 July 1914.
[150] "Editorial," *Hindustanee*, February 1914.

involvement in the imperial project in order to counter Kipling's racism. In an article on Indian soldiers on the Western Front, *Indian Views* wrote,

> "'East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,' is a popular belief but the British and Indian Post Offices do not accept it. Our Indian troops, fighting in France, have therefore, been supplied with Indian stamps, bearing the portrait of the King Emperor, 'I.E.F.' (Indian Expeditionary Force) overprinted on them…this is an especially interesting step on the part of the authorities, as it is the first time that Indian stamps have been used for postage in Europe."[151]

Focusing on mobile Indian bodies and print culture being used in the service of empire, *Indian Views* offered a vision of empire in which English and Indian mingled in person (on the Western Front), in images (the picture of the King "overprinted" with the IEF motto) and in text (as Indian letters were mailed from Europe). In contrast to the version espoused by the "Bard of Empire" and white colonial politicians, diasporic editors imagined a transnational empire of cultural exchange and individual mobility. In their periodicals they were able to create that empire in small by the collage of sources and citations that they collated and interpolated from across the globe.

Quoting British literature alongside Indian authors exemplified editors' vision of an empire in which the two nations improved and informed each other. Many editors declared one of their goals to be helping Britons, colonial settlers, and Indians better understand each other. The October and November 1911 issues of *The Aryan* explicitly stated that their practice of quoting from both British and Indian authors was part of their mission of bringing Britain and India into conversation with each other and, specifically, enlightening British readers as to the situation of Indians in the subcontinent and in Canada. These issues began with the declaration, "GATHER YE THE WISDOM OF EAST AND WEST," and proceeded to quote alternately between "eastern" and

[151] "Culled from Papers: Indian Stamps for Troops," *IV*, 25 December 1914.

"western" authors, including the Bible, the Rig Vedas, Edward Carpenter, Guru Nanak, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Dhammapada, Max Muller, and the Bhagavad Gita.[152] Moving between religious texts (Christian, Sikh, Hindu, and Buddhist) and political, social, and scientific works, *The Aryan* presented itself as a transnational, ecumenical space of intellectual exchange even before it began reporting on news of the day. *Indian Opinion* wrote something eerily similar in 1905 in introducing their expanded format. They explained that they were reproducing more material from other journals, particularly those from India, in order to better educate English-speaking Indians about political movements in India and to provide European readers with an understanding of Indian affairs. *Indian Opinion* avowed,

> "We are not of those who pin their faith to the 'East is East, and West is West' idea. We recognise no race or colour distinctions…With this idea in view…of endeavouring to draw the two sections of the community together in the bonds of mutual understanding and sympathy, we intend to devote a fixed portion of our weekly space to the reproduction of whatever seems to us to make towards the realisation of our ideal."[153]

Criticizing the version of imperialism that espoused Rudyard Kipling's belief that "East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet," both *Aryan* and *Indian Opinion* used quotations from other texts in order to provid a chance for English and Indian to "meet" across racial and geographical divides.

Conclusion

The periodicals examined here offer a direct window into the political life of diasporic Indians in South Africa and Canada. They represent the struggles, not only of a handful of editors, but of a much broader population of readers, interpolators, and

[152] *Aryan*, October and November 1911. See also, *Aryan*, September 1911.
[153] "Our Columns," *IO*, 14 September 1905. See also: Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 103; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 67-8.

activists to express political identity in the face of discrimination, poverty, and apathy. Although historians have used some of these newspapers to analyze political discourse, only a few analyzed the material reality of this diasporic print culture. In this dissertation, I argue that the material production of these papers and the discourse they articulated were mutually constitutive. This chapter analyzes the cut-and-paste technique by which editors saved labor and money, while at the same time implicitly (re)creating the forms of imperial unity and transnational exchange that they advocated. Circulation practices, too, evidence editors' desire to speak to a diasporic and imperial audience. Though citation and circulation, editors created a mobile print culture that transcended colony-metropole binary. While this chapter has set the stage, arguing that the discourse of imperial citizenship emerged out of a self-consciously imperial print culture, chapters two and three examine the political ramifications of this discourse. In particular, they explore the complications that emerged as the transnational discourse of imperial citizenship was integrated into different local contexts. Chapters four and five return to the material realities of this print culture, focusing on the role of activism and activists within the periodical. These final chapters argue that these papers materialized/manifested Indian imperial citizenship through the (re)production of political participation in the form of government documents, petitions, public meetings, and letters to the editor.

Chapter Two

The Problem of Imperial Citizenship: Immigration Restriction and Self-Government

On the eve of World War I, the *Manchester Guardian* warned that, "If a historian in the future came to write the decline and fall of the British Empire, we can imagine a chapter in which he saw the beginning of the end in the neglect by the Dominions of their responsibilities to the [other] races of the Empire."[1] Histories from Robert Huttenback's *Racism and Empire* to Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds' recent treatment of the transnational *Drawing of the Global Colour Line* have accepted the assessment that immigration restriction in the settler colonies at the turn of the twentieth century was a "betrayal of the idea of imperial citizenship" and of British imperial liberalism more generally.[2] Certainly historical observers, from Conservative British statesmen to radical Indian nationalists, agreed that the problem of immigration restriction and of racial legislation more generally threatened the safety and unity of the British empire. However, analysis of Indian activists' invocations of imperial citizenship reveals a much more complex political conflict than a straightforward transition from racially-inclusive imperial citizenship to racially-exclusive nationalism. Rather, the discourse of imperial citizenship allows us to see intricate and shifting debates over the nature of imperial rule, self-government, and racial and political forms of belonging.

Imperial citizenship, immigration restriction, and self-government: an introduction

Imperial citizenship was a capacious, ill-defined, and powerful discourse used across racial, political, and geographic boundaries in the British Empire at the turn of the twentieth century. This dissertation follows Sukanya Banerjee's call to consider the

[1] *Manchester Guardian*, quoted in "Truth Will Out," *India*, 28 November 1913.
[2] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*.

"extralegal life of citizenship."[3] As Banerjee argues, neither imperial nor Indian citizenship were codified during this time period;[4] yet Indian (and, I would add, British) commentators acted *as if* citizenship were a valid legal status. Through assertion and contestation, imperial citizenship emerged as a shared, if variegated, discursive field that held real political power. To practice the "textualization of citizenship"—the recognition that citizenship was a discourse in addition to (or in lieu of) a statutory status—requires some clarifications that attend to the discursive uses of citizenship.[5] These uses often contradict our legalistic assumptions of what the term meant.

Existing histories of imperial citizenship rightly identify the period from 1880 to 1920 as a crucial period in the emergence and solidification of both imperial citizenship and self-government in the white settler colonies. With the formal assumption of monarchical and Parliamentary supervision over India in the wake of the 1857 Rebellion, the determination of Crown Colony status for Jamaica in response to the Morant Bay Rebellion, the creation of a Canadian Parliament in 1867, and the expansion of the franchise in Britain itself, self-government became ever more closely aligned with whiteness.[6]

Immigration restriction and anti-Indian legislation more generally were central to white settler colonies' transition to self-government. Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, white self-governing colonists flexed their new powers of

[3] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 7.
[4] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 4-5.
[5] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 5.
[6] Catherine Hall, "The Nation Without and Within," in *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender, and the British Reform Act of 1867*, eds. Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland, and Jane Rendall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Hall, *Civilising Subjects*; Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), esp. 17-22; John Darwin, "A Third Empire: The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: the Twentieth Century*, eds. Judith M. Brown and William Roger Louis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 64-7.

national independence by passing laws directed against Asians, tying national unity tightly to race in an attempt to stem imperial mobilities.[7] It was not until 1902 at the end of the Second Anglo-Boer War that the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony came under direct British rule and not until 1910 were the British and Afrikaner colonies united in the country of South Africa. Thus the unification of the South African nation and its transition to self-government overlapped exactly with a rise in anti-Indian legislation in British and Afrikaner provinces alike. In Canada, the grant of self-government had come much earlier; however, the period between 1890 and 1914 likewise saw the beginning of Canadian challenges to imperial control, often over questions of anti-Indian legislation.[8] These laws served to demarcate self-governing colonies' independence from British imperial oversight on the one hand and the difference between them and the non-white colonies on the other hand.

The existing historiography on immigration restriction and imperial citizenship, while offering important analyses of the imbrications of democracy, whiteness, and settler colonialism, is focused on debates between white settlers, colonial governments, and imperial officials.[9] This ignores the extent to which Indian and other non-white activists contested dominant European definitions of imperial citizenship, self-government, and whiteness. With the exception of recent work by a few scholars the

[7] Gregory, *India and East Africa*; Huttenback, "White Man's Country"; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*; Radhika Viya Mongia, "Race, Nationality, Mobility: A History of the Passport," in *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 196-216; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; Karatani, *Defining*, 57, 74-94; McKeown, *Melancholy Order;* Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*, 20; Gorman, "Wider and Wider Still?"; Boucher, "Geopolitical Reconfiguration."
[8] This tradition carried on well into the twentieth century. Britain's 1948 British Nationality Act was in large part a response to Canada's decision in 1946 to pass its own citizenship bill without consulting Britain or the other Commonwealth countries (Karatani, *Defining*, 93-4).
[9] Gorman, *Imperial Citizenship*; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; McKeown, *Melancholy Order*; Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of the World, 1860-1900* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

existing histories of imperial citizenship end up re-inscribing the relationship between whiteness, imperial citizenship, and self-government that colonists were trying to naturalize at the turn of the century.[10] Most historians of imperial citizenship and the British world have assumed that a version of imperial federation that was anchored to British identity automatically excluded Indians.[11] Yet Indian activists turned this rhetoric against white settlers, arguing that racial discrimination was un-British, and therefore that Indian immigrants were the proper inheritors and defenders of British cultural heritage, as opposed to "un-British" settlers. Until at least 1914, Indian activists successfully kept the question of their imperial citizenship before a British imperial audience. Although in practical terms, this period saw a continual rolling back of Indian rights, the influence of their discursive challenge should not go unmarked.

This chapter builds and expands on previous scholarship by analyzing how Indian interlocutors approached the intersection of imperial citizenship and self-government. While historians have previously focused on immigration restriction as a source of tension over the limits of self-government for white settlers, attention to Indian sources reframes the debate in terms of a much more complex set of arguments. This debate troubled the connections between self-government and whiteness while revealing the imbrications of Indian nationalism and imperialism as Indians struggled to articulate their position within the empire.[12] In other words, the debate over immigration restriction *was* fundamentally a debate over self-government, but it was as much about Indian self-government as about the white settler colonies. This chapter explores the ways in which

[10] Banerjee, *Becoming*; Sinha, "Strange Death"; Reed, "Respectable Subjects"; Rush and Reed, "Imperial Citizenship."
[11] Gorman, "Wider and Wider,"; Bell, *Greater Britain*, 9-10; Mohanram, *Imperial White*, 12.
[12] Jonathon Hyslop, "An 'Eventful' History of *Hind Swaraj*: Gandhi between the Battle of Tsushima and the Union of South Africa," *Public Culture* 23, no. 2 (2011): 312.

Indians engaged with, appropriated, and subverted British ideas of the empire in order to challenge the supremacy of white settler federation. The story of Indian responses to immigration restriction from 1890-1914 is twofold, then: it is a story of how Indians appropriated discourses of imperial power and British morality against legalized racial exclusivity and a story of how imperial power gradually was ceded to national authority.

Subject or citizen?: Legal distinctions and discursive conflations

The distinction between citizenship as discourse and citizenship as legal entity is important first and foremost because the category of "imperial citizen" or even "British citizen" did not exist in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. British citizen did not appear in statute books until the 1981 British Nationality Act, which (not coincidentally) was aimed at restricting black and Asian immigration.[13] From the late nineteenth century, the trend of citizenship laws within the British empire was firstly to give increased autonomy to the self-governing colonies, and secondarily to reinforce connections between Britain and the white self-governing colonies while increasing the political difference between the white and non-white colonies.[14] Codification of British subject status first began with the 1914 British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, but the BNSA, as critics were quick to point out, while recognizing a shared British subjecthood across the empire, left citizenship status in the colonies up to individual definition.[15] Many British and Indian observers objected that such an arrangement

[13] Karatani, *Defining*, 1, 28-9, 144-45, 183; McClelland and Rose, "Citizenship and empire," 278; Salman Rushdie, "The New Empire Within Britain," in *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991* (London: Granta Books, 1991), 133-4, 136.
[14] Karatani, *Defining*, chapters two and three.
[15] Karatani, *Defining*, 29-30, 80.

vitiated the meaning of imperial citizenship and thus of imperial power.[16] The 1948 British Nationality Act extended and reinforced this distinction, by translating British subject status into Commonwealth citizenship, while allowing each Commonwealth country to choose its own citizenship criteria.[17] Self-governing colonies could determine citizenship as it affected voting rights, recognition of domicile, and (increasingly) temporary or permanent immigration. These rights might apply to British subjects—or not. However, any citizen of the self-governing colonies was (after 1914) considered a naturalized British subject. Thus, recognition of British subjecthood or Commonwealth citizenship was only guaranteed within Britain, nowhere else in the empire.

What is most striking about citizenship statutes, however, is that before 1914 neither British subject nor imperial citizen was defined in law. Well into the twentieth century the terms subject and citizen remained ill-defined in regards to both empire and Britain. This lack of legal specificity is key to understanding the force of imperial citizenship; as a free-floating discourse that was believed to have a legal force but which was never specifically codified, imperial citizenship could serve as a widely shared discourse that could be harnessed to divergent political agendas.

This lack of definition is demonstrated most clearly in the way in which Indian, British, and colonial interlocutors approached the distinction between subject and citizen. Legally, subject is defined in terms of obligations, while citizen is defined by rights.[18] Through this lens, Indians in the British empire would be classified as subjects, not

---

[16] *Yorkshire Post*, paraphrased in "News in Brief," *IO*, 17 June 1914; *Yorkshire Post*, paraphrased in "Notes and News," *India*, 22 May 1914; *African Times and Orient Review*, quoted in "Imperial Citizenship," *Indian Emigrant*, September 1914.
[17] Karatani, *Defining*, 126, 149. V. K. Krishna Menon and Jawaharlal Nehru suggested a "common citizenship" for the Commonwealth, specifically with the idea that this would prevent South Africa from excluding Indians, but the white Dominions refused to agree (Karatani, *Defining*, 124).
[18] McClelland and Rose, "Citizenship and Empire," 278.

citizens. Thus, Banerjee argues that imperial citizenship "strains against the Indians' status as subject."[19] Yet this formulation ignores the extent to which Indian as well as British and colonial politicians simply ignored any such distinction. Commentators at the time used subject and citizen virtually interchangeably, with the two words being used in the same article or speech, and even within the same sentence.[20] Canadian Indian petitioners declared, "we are subjects of the British Empire and have inalienable rights like other citizens of the Empire."[21] While Banerjee states that Indians claimed imperial citizenship in order to "transcend the inscription—'poor,' 'black,' even 'Indian'—marking their position *as* subjects," I find their approach to the citizen/subject divide even more politically astute.[22] By using the two terms interchangeably, Indian proponents of imperial citizenship refused to engage the terms of debate that rendered them as powerless subjects because of their race while enfranchising whites as citizens. Instead, they articulated citizen-subject as two sides of the same coin, allowing them to make their argument for imperial citizenship based on wider claims than mere subjecthood would allow. Activists contested anti-Indian legislation based both on their loyal service as British subjects *and* as rights-bearing citizens. This allowed for the erasure of their present lack of rights by invoking simultaneously past protection (as subjects) and future

[19] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 1.
[20] See for example: Gopal Gokhale, quoted in "The Indian National Congress," *AC*, 19 February 1910; Lord Ampthill, quoted in Reuter (London, September 24), quoted in "Indians in South Africa," *AC*, 30 September 1911; Aiyar, *The Indian Problem*, 1; London All-India Moslem League to Colonial Office, 25 November 1913, *Union of South Africa Correspondence relating of the Immigrants Regulation Act and other matters affecting Asiatics in South Africa* Cd.7111, (London: Darling and Son, Ltd., 1913), GLDC HIST 1900-1914; J. Edward Bird, quoted in "Minutes of a Hindu Mass Meeting Held in Dominion Hall, Vancouver, 21 June 1914," LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, part 3; Canada India Committee, *The Hindu Case* (Toronto, 1915).
[21] Petition to SSI, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 4.
[22] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 2

power (as imperial/national citizens). Indians could not recognize a distinction between citizen and subject because to do so would be to reify their status as dependent subjects.

Those few who did police the difference were staunch supporters of white federalism. Anti-Indian politicians like the British Columbia Conservative Member of Parliament H. H. Stevens argued that Indian immigrants were "FELLOW SUBJECTS, BUT THERE IS A GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN BEING A FELLOW SUBJECT AND HAVING THE STATUS OF A FELLOW CITIZEN."[23] *The Hindustanee* periodical responded that Stevens' distinction between "subject or citizen is a quibble."[24] By and large, Indian opponents of immigration restriction (and often their British allies) simply denied any distinction between subject and citizen.

This usage allowed imperial citizenship to serve as an umbrella term, obscuring the wide disparity in political agendas held by those who used the term. Because imperial citizenship was not codified in law, its exact meaning was continually being negotiated. The defense of Indians overseas generated support from an astounding range of political actors who built a loose coalition around the shared discourse of imperial citizenship. In London, the cause of Indians overseas was championed by Dadabhai Naoroji and Sir

[23] H. H. Stevens, quoted in "Hindu is Fellow Subject, Not Citizen," *Aryan* May 1912, capitalization in the original. Stevens put forward this argument on many occasions, although he seemed to switch between discussing imperial, British, and Canadian citizenship. See for example: Stevens, quoted in "Canada and Asiatic Immigration," *AC*, July 20, 1912; "The Immigration Problem: Mr. H. H. Stevens, M. P. Makes an Earnest Plea for the exclusion of Orientals," *The Orilla Packet*, 21 May 1914, in LAC Stevens Papers [henceforth SP], MG27 III B9, Volume 171, Folder, Hindu Immigration Incident 1912, January 1914-May 1914. For similar statements by other politicians, see: Banerjee, *Becoming*, 25; "An Epoch-Making Opportunity for Anglo-Saxons," *Westminster Hall Magazine and Farther West Review,* July 1914, VCA Komagata Maru file, Box 244-E-6, Folder 1; D. F. Malan, paraphrased in "What is British Citizenship?" *Times* (20 July), quoted in *AC,* 2 November 1912; Lewis Vernon Harcourt, quoted in "Imperial Parliament: "Special Report for 'India' of All Parliamentary Proceedings Relating to India": Thursday, February 12: House of Commons: The South African Deportations," *India*, 20 February 1914.

[24] "Mr. H. H. Stevens, M. P., Imposes His Ignorance on the Federal House on the Hindu Question: Backbites Bai [sic] Bhagwan Singh, Heaps Base Slanders on Hindustanees," *Hindustanee*, April 1914. See also: "Hindus Challenge Mr. Stevens to Corroborate His Statements," *Aryan*, May 1912; "The Debate in the Lords," *AC*, 24 February 1912; T. K. Swaminathan, "British Subject and Empire Citizen," *IE,* November 1914.

Mancherjee Bhownaggree. Liberal Party MP Naoroji and Conservative MP Bhownaggree disagreed on almost all political issues, yet in this they were allied. Their support for Indians overseas is explained by their position as "spokesmen" for India in London.[25] At the other end of the political spectrum, Ghadr party members like Taraknath Das used the language of imperial citizenship to shame the British Raj and foment rebellion.[26] The Vancouver-based activist Teja Singh, for example, met with Ghadr Party members Har Dayal and Balwant Singh, yet he also worked closely with the Victoria Society of Friends, a white Canadian organization whose defense of Indian subjects was rooted in Christian paternalism.[27] From Lala Lajpat Rai to Lord Curzon, the politics of transnational Indian citizenship made for very strange bedfellows. And yet it would be a great mistake to interpret this shared discourse as evidence of a shared political project. On the contrary, many of those who defended the rights of Indians overseas did so for widely divergent reasons and used a shared discourse without creating any kind of more substantial political cooperation or even dialogue. A close analysis of the discourse of imperial citizenship must attend to the ways in which its extensive reach was riven with ruptures and contradictions.

---

[25] Julie Codell, "Decentring and Doubling Imperial Cosmpolitan Discourse in the British Press: Dadabhai Naoroji and M. M. Bhownaggree," *Media History* 15, no. 4 (2009): 371-384; Barry A. Kosmin, "London's Asian M.P.s: The Contrasting Careers of three Parsee politicians," *Indo-British Review: A Journal of History* 16, no. 2 (June 1989): 27-38; Antoinette Burton, "Tongues Untied: Lord Salisbury's 'Black Man' and the Boundaries of Imperial Democracy," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43, no. 2 (2000): 632-3; C. L. Inness, *A History of Black and Asian Writing in Britain*, 2nd Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 2008), 170.

[26] Petition from the Friends of Hindustan (San Francisco) to Viceroy and SSI, 3 December 1910, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568. See also: petition from Swadesh Sevak Home to SSI, 24 April 1910, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; Taraknath Das, "Hindu Question in United State of America: No. 2," *Hindustanee*, March 1914; Lala Lajpat Rai, quoted in "The 28th Indian National Congress at Karachi," *The Hindu*, quoted in *AC*, 31 January 1914.

[27] J. M. McGill to W. W. Cory, 21 January 1909, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 3,; Robert William Clark to Robert Borden, 18 November 1911, LAC Sir Robert Borden Papers [henceforth BP] MG26 H1(c), Volume 247, 145270 to 145306, Microfilm Reel C-4423; "The Hindu Deputation to the Dominion Government," *Aryan*, December 1911; copy of Government of India Criminal Intelligence office report on Teja Singh June 1909, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/930, File 1309; Sohi, "Repressing," 58.

The extent to which imperial citizenship was a shared, if contested, discourse is exemplified by the participation of prominent British and Indian statesmen across the political divide. Many ex-ICS officials or Anglo-Indians in the colonies wrote in defense of Indian immigrants.[28] Conservative politicians such as Ampthill, Curzon, and Sydenham became staunch defenders of Indians overseas upon their return to England from stints as unpopular Raj officials who virulently opposed Indian nationalism.[29] The transition from anti-nationalist officials to the foremost Parliamentary exponents of Indian imperial citizenship seems contradictory. Indian activists interpreted this contradiction as evidence that the problem of Indian immigration surpassed questions of politics or nationality and was truly "a question of Imperial importance."[30] V. J. Patel observed that "although in English politics he [Ampthill] belongs to that party which is always associated in the Indian mind with narrowness and prejudice, he has set an example to his political colleagues and to all others what Imperialism means" in his advocacy on behalf of South African Indians.[31] Patel emphasized the fact that Ampthill was a Conservative politician to bolster his own argument that anti-Indian racism was not

[28] U. de P. Webb [sic, typo for M. de P. Webb, member of the Bombay Legislative Council], quoted in *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Anglo-Indian Legislator: On the Indian Question," *AC*, 26 November 1910; also quoted in "Prominent Anglo-Indian Interviewed: Transvaal Problem a Matter of World-Wide Importance: 'A Glorious Opportunity,'" *IO*, 26 November 1910; "The London Meeting: Sir Charles Dilke and the East India Association," *IO*, 6 August 1903; An Anglo-Indian [pseud.], "The Asiatic Problem: Plea for a Compromise," *Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in *IO*, 6 May 1905; E. Blake Robertson to W. D. Scott, 27 Dec. 1906, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 1.

[29] Ampthill served as Governor of Madras and interim Viceroy; Sydenham as Governor of Bombay; and Curzon as Viceroy. Curzon's aggressive actions while in office triggered a resurgence of violent anti-British nationalism from 1905-1920. Ampthill became president of the South African British Indian Committee, while Curzon served as a life member of the East India Association, and both brought motions in Parliament in defense of Indians in South Africa and Canada from 1908 to 1924, but most frequently between 1911 and 1914 (the height of the passive resistance movement).

[30] "British Indians in the Transvaal [typescript]," 1, GLDC HIST 1906/1914. See also: "Mr. Smuts on the South African Problem," *AC,* 9 October 1909; ""Grief and Joy," *IO,* 2 February 1907; "The London Meeting," *IO*, 23 July 1903.

[31] V. J. Patel, quoted in "Great Meeting at Bombay: Lord Ampthill thanked," *IO,* 11 February 1914. See also *India*'s praise of Sydenham and Curzon for supporting South African Indians in their 1 August 1913 issue, followed by an article in the following issue criticizing both Sydenham and Curzon for trying to suppress Indian nationalism.

just an Indian nationalist concern but was also anathema to Britain and empire. At the same time, Ampthill and Curzon defended Indians overseas for their own political agenda, which their Indian allies cannily ignored. Ampthill and Curzon were quite explicit about the fact that they supported the rights of Indians overseas in order to maintain the prestige of the Raj and to postpone self-government in the subcontinent. As Curzon observed,

> "He [the Indian in South Africa] claims the full rights of citizenship of the British Empire. I do not think it is for us to blame him for that. We have taught it him. We have inspired him with these ideas. They are the result of our speeches, our writings, our textbooks, which he studies in India, our principles of administration and of education…I do not think we ought to say anything or do anything to depreciate or to deride it in the smallest degree; because it is, after all, the only basis upon which you can expect the loyalty of an Asiatic population to an alien rule to be permanently developed or maintained."[32]

On the one hand, Conservative imperialists clearly supported Indians overseas in the hopes of quieting Indian nationalist agitation. At the same time, it is striking to hear such a full-throated defense of Indian imperial citizenship from a politician who was renowned for his fierce opposition to Indian (and Irish) nationalism. Curzon's rhetoric is but one example of how ubiquitous claims to imperial citizenship were and the extent to which they crossed (note that I do not say they transcended) traditional political and demographic divides.

Threat to Empire: The Transnational Problem of Immigration Restriction

Immigration restriction threatened the British empire at two key points. Explicitly racial legislation undermined the empire's claim to rest on principles of equality and

[32] Curzon, Hansard Parliamentary Debate, 4 February 1908. See also: Ampthill to Curzon, Confidential, 14 November 1909, MSS EUR F112/79; Ampthill, "Introduction," to J. J. Doke, *M. K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot of South Africa,* quoted in "An Indian Patriot in South Africa; An Introduction by Lord Ampthill," *IO*, 18 December 1909; *Saturday Review*, quoted in "Self-Government and Empire," *India,* 12 December 1913; *Times of India*, quoted in *India*, quoted in *CIN,* 20 June 1902.

liberty and attacked the fundamental principle of imperial citizenship.[33] According to the British Parliament, these laws could not specifically exclude Indians by race or nationality, and so the colonies developed ingenious means of excluding Indians without naming them, whether through monetary requirements, language tests, restrictions on travel itineraries, or simple recourse to "administrative discretion."[34] Despite these evasions, anti-Indian legislation "attained the height of a civil war," pitting Britain, India, and the settler colonies against each other.[35] Fears (and threats) that either India or the settler colonies would leave the empire over the issue were rampant.[36] Immigration

[33] McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, 186; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*, 21; Huttenback, "White Man's Country," 110-11; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, esp. 5; Pachai, *International Aspects*, 9-15, 28; "The Natal Witness and 'Human Shoddy,'" *CIN,* 22 November 1901; "Lest Union be Wrecked," *IO*, 28 August 1909; "Cause of Indian Discontent," *AC,* 20 November 1909. For white settler and British sources, see: resolution from Vancouver Society of Friends to Ottawa, quoted in "Asiatic Immigration," *Daily News Advertiser*, 3 May 1913, enclosed in W. C. Hopkinson to Cory, 5 May 1913, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1246, File 2152; "Growing European Sympathy," *IO*, 7 December 1907; proprietor of *Times of India*, forwarded to Ampthill, forwarded to Press, quoted in Reuter, quoted in "The Asiatic Problem in Canada: Various Rumours and Stories: By the 'Times' Correspondent: An Appeal to the Imperial Government: Lord Ampthill and Indian Grievances," *IO*, 28 March 1908; South Africa British India Committee [henceforth SABIC] form letter, quoted in "The Transvaal Struggle: A Great Movement in London: Support and Subscriptions," *IO*, 11 December 1909. For subcontinental sources, see: Annie Besant, reported in *Christian Commonwealth,* quoted in "A Plea for India Indians: Outside India," *India*, 22 May 1914; Bombay Provincial Conference resolution, quoted in "A Dangerous Policy," *IO,* 15 June 1907; Salem meeting resolution, quoted in *Madras Mail*, quoted in "Public Opinion in India: On the South African Question: At Salem," *IO*, 4 December 1909.

[34] Allen, "'Innocents abroad,'" 114, 119-21; Mongia, "Race, Nationality, Mobility," 200-10; Uma Dhupelia-Mesthrie, "The Form, the Permit and the Photograph: An Archive of Mobility between South African and India," *Journal of Asian and African Studies,* 46, no. 6 (2011), 655-7; Enakshi Dua, "Racialising Imperial Canada: Indian women and the making of ethnic communities," in *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernities*, ed. Antoinette Burton (London: Routledge, 1999), 122; Gregory, *India and East Africa*, 127-130; Huttenback, "White Man's Country"; Huttenback, *Racism and Empire*, esp. chapters three and four; Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*; McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, esp. parts two and three; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, esp. chapter one.

[35] "Indians in East Africa: British Subject [sic] vs. British Subjects," in *Indian Voice*, quoted in *AC,* 16 September 1911, 7. See also: Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 11; petition from Canadian Indians to Ottawa, quoted in "The Hindu Deputation to the Dominion Government," *Aryan,* December 1911; resolution quoted in "Indians in London: Meeting at Caxton Hall: (Special Report for 'India'): Indians and The Overseas Dominions," *India,* 26 June 1914; "British Indians in Australia," *IO*, 4 February 1904; Resolution of Vancouver Sikhs to SSI, quoted in "The Indian Question in Canada," *India,* quoted in *AC,* 25 August 1912.

[36] Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 184; Santani, "Random Thoughts," *AC*, 28 November 1908; Gokhale, reported in "Is the Empire a Mockery," *AC,* 9 November 1912; A. G. Gardiner, "The Challenge of Asia," *Daily News,* quoted in *India,* 19 June 1914; Robert William Clark to Wilfred Laurier, 15 August 1911,

restriction thus raised philosophical and practical questions about the fundamental nature of the British empire, what the relationship between nation and empire was, and whether the empire was best represented by the reality of its racial hierarchy or by an idealized commitment to race-blind justice.

Indian nationalists, British imperialists, and white settlers alike agreed that the treatment of Indians overseas constituted "the greatest danger to the Empire."[37] Gandhi's newspaper *Indian Opinion* compared racial legislation to a natural disaster, harkening back to Afrikaners' origin in Holland, saying that Holland was protected from floods by dikes and sea-walls but

> "the Hollanders know that a small opening in the sea-wall on the coast of North Holland portends disaster for every citizens in every other part of the country. Let the Indians of South Africa partake of the real Dutch courage that induces every true son of Holland to stop the breach, before the small driblet becomes a raging, roaring, destructive torrent."[38]

In a bizarrely creative extended metaphor, *Indian Opinion* identified racial prejudice as an unmanly and unpatriotic sentiment, furthered their teetotalism campaign through a pun on "Dutch courage," and described racial prejudice in South Africa as a containable, but potentially life-threatening peril to the country and the empire. Indians and their supporters conjured up images of previous empires' declines due to injustice, apathy, and weakness to warn Britain what lay ahead if they did not control the white settler colonies' abuse of Indians. Vancouver activist Teja Singh and South African editor P. S. Aiyar made strikingly similar arguments comparing racial prejudice in the British empire to the role of caste divisions in India's fall from greatness. They attributed the fall of the Aryan,

---

LAC Sir Wilfred Laurier Papers [henceforth LP], Series A, Correspondence, Volume 690, pg 188953 to 188956, Microfilm Reel C-906.

[37] "Cause of Indian Discontent," *AC,* 20 November 1909.

[38] "From the Editor's Chair: The Race-Bar," *IO*, 1 April 1911.

Roman, Greek, and Persian empires to race-consciousness and warned that the British empire would end the same way if it excluded Indians.[39] According to this interpretation, anti-Indian legislation did not just threaten Indian immigrants, it endangered the entire empire.

Immigration legislation, standing at the border between domestic and imperial/international legislation, was perfectly positioned to prize open the most complex issues surrounding self-government within the empire. These laws went to the heart of vexed questions about the nature of imperial structure: what was the relationship of self-governing colonies to imperial authority? what did imperial citizenship mean in the context of self-governing colonies? who deserved self-government?

Such questions were infused with a racialized discourse of Britishness, as Indians overseas confronted the paradox of an empire ostensibly predicated on racial equality and the reality of white supremacy that undergirded imperial control. By arguing that anti-Indian legislation was un-British in principle and un-imperial in its fragmenting effects, Indians presented themselves as ideal imperial citizens in contrast to willful and selfish white settlers. Recognition of imperial citizenship, like the grant of self-government, was dependent on evidence of respectability, a term that encompassed modes of dress, education, and comportment, all designed to prove the claimant's gender, class, and race-based claim to such rights. Advocates of Indian imperial citizenship emphasized their British heritage, a cultural inheritance evidenced by literacy, comportment, and imperial loyalty. That heritage carried distinctly racial overtones in an age where race was

[39] Teja Singh, "'Tis a Destiny that Shapes our Ends Rough Hew them How We Will," *Aryan,* February 1912; Teja Singh, reported in "Sharply Critical of British Rule," *Vancouver Province,* 23 November 1908, enclosed in Hopkinson to Cory, 18 January 1909, BL/IOR L/PJ/6/930, File 1309; Aiyar, *Indian Problem,* 141.

dependent on behavior as well as physical characteristics. While chapter three maps various permutations of the racialization of imperial citizenship, this chapter focuses on the political implications of Britishness as a necessary pre-cursor to self-government, while not loosing sight of the fact that Britishness was an implicitly racialized discourse.

Indian nationalists used imperial citizenship to combat white settler ideas of self-government. They argued, first, that the imperial government had veto power over the self-governing colonies and, later, that India deserved and required self-government in order to protect its subjects from the colonies. In doing so, Indians articulated a particular definition of imperialism based on non-racialism, fraternal co-operation, and obedience to the British imperial government, values that they identified as particularly British. Through their appropriation of the discourse of Britishness, Indian activists were able to simultaneously argue for the disenfranchisement of un-British settlers and to argue for their own rights in India and in the settler colonies as imperial citizens and Britons.

Un-British legislation: the racialized dimensions of anti-racism

According to its opponents, anti-Indian legislation in the colonies was in violation of the imperial principles of racial equality of treatment for all subjects. Commentators across the empire—Indians, Britons, and even some white settler colonists—argued that the ideal of imperial citizenship applied regardless of race and that opponents of immigration restriction were fighting in defense of the British empire's principle of racial equality for all imperial citizens. Immigration restriction "destroy[ed] the conception of any common citizenship of the Empire"[40] and "granted that an Indian so soon as he

[40] *The Nation*, quoted in "Notes and News," *India*, 17 July 1914; also quoted in "Comments and Criticisms: The 'Nation' on Citizenship," *IE*, August 1914.

leaves India, ceases to be a British subject."[41] This argument blamed white settlers for destroying imperial unity through their racialized attacks on imperial citizenship. Indian petitions and publications frequently reminded imperial politicians that British ministers and monarchs had made promises "regarding equality of treatment irrespective of race, colour or creed."[42] Surendranath Banerjee's moderate nationalist paper *The Bengalee* was not alone in declaring that "If the citizen of the Empire criterion is to be replaced by the colour and race criterion then the Queen's Proclamation must be cancelled."[43] This referred to Queen Victoria's Proclamation, issued in the wake of the Indian Mutiny of 1857, which transferred sovereignty from the East India Company to the British crown while also promising Indian subjects freedom of worship and equal treatment with all other British subjects. Despite the fact that the Proclamation of 1858 made no mention of immigration, diasporic Indians imagined it to have weight far beyond the geographical boundaries of the subcontinent and the juridical boundaries of the Raj. *The Bengalee* thus set up imperial citizenship as a non-racial category and juxtaposed colonial racism to Queen Victoria's imperial Proclamation. This rhetoric positioned Indian activists as staunch defenders of imperial tradition. Immigration restriction, particularly on explicitly racial grounds, was deemed to be contrary to ideals of imperial citizenship and to British traditions of racial equality and fair treatment.

---

[41] petition from the Indians of Natal (Durban, 18 September 1897), Killie Campbell Library MS IND.
[42] typescript copy of petition from Natal Indian Congress [henceforth NIC] to the Secretary of State for the Colonies [henceforth SSC], enclosed in NIC to Governor General (South Africa), 15 May 1911, SAB GG LEER Volume 889, 15/132. See also: Petition from South African Indians (T. Dorasamy Iyar, P. C. Padayachey, P. Moonlight Moonoosamy Modlelliar, and A. A. Pillay) to Curzon, March 1903, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/628, File 402; Annexure to the Petition, Annex C, Copies of Resolutions of the Special Meeting, TNA CO 291/61, Transvaal No 14411; M. K. Gandhi, "Notes on the Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa," 22 September 1896, GLDC HIST 1906/1914; petition from Hindu Friend Society of Victoria to SSC, 28 April 1911, BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/1064, File 568.
[43] "Telegrams: Allahabad Imperialism," *Bengalee*, May 29, 1914.

Opponents of immigration restriction depicted such legislation as un-British because it violated the supposedly British values of race-blind justice and fair play.[44] Despite the fact that it was British settlers and politicians enforcing anti-Indian legislation, the idea of Britain as a moral exemplar pervaded the empire. In the eighteenth through twentieth centuries, the dominant historical narrative framed Britain as a nation of ever-expanding values of liberty, justice, and fair play. This mythos was reproduced throughout the empire as colonial elites were increasingly educated in British history, literature, and language.[45] Many Indian authors in this period navigated the contradiction between this imagined Britain and the racist empire they encountered by creating a rhetorical distance between Britain as a political space and Britain as a moral ideal. Aiyar struggled with exactly this opposition in his first English-Tamil newspaper, *Colonial Indian News*. A 1902 article inveighed against "this black list of Laws that render the professions of proverbial British Justice a hypocracy [sic], and their love of Imperialism a mockery…[this is a] disgraceful and unBritish [sic] treatment meted to the Indians in this garden colony."[46] Aiyar solved the contradiction between "proverbial British Justice" and anti-Indian legislation by maintaining an underlying conviction that despite this "hypocrisy," such laws were still fundamentally "unBritish." Britishness still reigned as the moral arbiter of justice despite the racism of British "justice" in action. Meanwhile,

[44] E. R. Grace, quoted in "Canada Condemns Color," *Aryan*, July 1912; telegram from NIC to Governor General (South Africa), 8 September 1913, SAB GG LEER 896, 15/468; resolution of Caxton Hall June 23 meeting, quoted in "Indians in London: Meeting at Caxton Hall: Mr. Bhupendranath Basu," *IE*, August 1914.

[45] The petition from Indians in Canada to House of Commons in Ottawa, reprinted in "The Hindu Petition," *Aryan*, August 1911 referred to the "legend of British freedom and justice". For more on the effect of British education on Indian elites, see: Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); Sumita Mukherjee, *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities: The England-returned* (London: Routledge, 2010); Judith M. Brown, "Gandhi--a Victorian gentleman: An essay in imperial encounter," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 68-85; Hunt, *Gandhi in London*; Antoinette Burton, *At the Heart of the empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

[46] "The Proposed Indian Commission," *CIN*, September 27, 1902.

such "black" laws rendered the whiteness as well as the Britishness of settler colonists suspect.[47]

Much like "un-British," terms such as "uncivilized"[48] and "un-Christian"[49] functioned in racialized ways to undermine white settlers' claim to self-government. Aiyar wrote that the £3 tax on ex-indentured laborers was "more suited to medieval times than to the twentieth century," being "cruel, unchristian and inhuman."[50] In this editorial, Aiyar presented Indians as those who would school white colonists in the conduct necessary to self-government. Emphasizing South Africa's liminal status as a recent entry to the ranks of the self-governing colonies, Aiyar reversed the traditional colonial order by presenting white colonists as "backward" and "uncivilized." Likewise, Annie Besant argued that England should not have given self-government to the Afrikaners because they "'have not learnt the first principles of liberty. She [Britain] ought to have kept them under government until they learnt respect for their fellow-citizens.'"[51] Immigration laws were described as "tyrannical," "feudal," "slavish," "barbarous," "savage," and "ungodly."[52] These descriptors resonated at a racial level, yet had specific implications

[47] In an age in which race, nationality, and conduct were closely related, Britishness (and whiteness) were floating signifiers of respectability that were simultaneously heavily racialized and yet could be used to apply to non-British, non-white peoples or taken away from white Britons. For more, see chapter 3.
[48] Petition from South African Indians (T. Dorasamy Iyar, P. C. Padayachey, P. Moonlight Moonoosamy Modlelliar, and A. A. Pillay) to Curzon, March 1903, BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/628, File 402; Mysterious Outlook," *AC*, 29 October 1910; United India League and Khalsa Diwan deputation (Prof. Teja Singh, Rev. L. W. Hall, Raja Singh and Dr. Sundar [sic] Singh) to Ottawa, 15 December 1911, in Proof 5277 Published India Office papers, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 9.
[49] Bhussmasoor [pseud.], "Magna Charta and King John," *AC*, 6 February 1909; Verb Sap [pseud.], "Correspondence: Tax on Indian Women," *AC*, 6 November 1909; telegram, Inhabitants of Kathor to Viceroy, 26 December 1907, TNA CO 291/131, Transvaal Nol. 8958; Canada India Committee, *A Call for Canadian Justice* (Toronto, 1915).
[50] "From the Editor's chair: The True Position of £3 Tax Payers," *AC*, 8 November 1913. For similar comparisons out of Canada, see: "Where is Bhai Bhagwan Singh?" *Hindustanee*, January 1914.
[51] Besant, "'Sons of India': Are they Citizens of the Empire?" *Beharee*, quoted in *IO*, 19 June 1909..
[52] A. Royeppen, "Correspondence," *AC*, 26 December 1908; petition from NIC to SSC, enclosed in NIC to Governor General (South Africa), 15 May 1911, SAB GG LEER Volume 889, 15/132; telegram, chairman mass meeting Lucknow to SSC, 24 November 1913, SAB GG LEER Volume 898, 15/586; telegram, Zemindar of Singampatti, 20 November 1913, SAB GG LEER Volume 898, 15/607; "Indians in South

for white settlers' status as self-governing colonists. In the historical developmentalist logic of empire, "barbarous," "savage," and even "feudal" peoples were not yet ready for self-government and required the benevolent despotism of British rule.[53] Indian activists took such rhetoric, often used to disenfranchise Indians, and turned it against white settlers, portraying colonial society and government as less historically, politically, and racially developed. This discourse undermined settlers' claims to deserve self-government, all the while underscoring Indian nationalists' superior understanding of British values, and, hence, their right to imperial citizenship. These arguments had a political and a racial effect: colonists' un-British, uncivilized behavior marked them as not-quite-white, which in turn disqualified them from the rights of imperial citizenship and self-government.

Accusations that anti-Indian laws went against the British "constitution" likewise carried both political and racial connotations, playing on the double meaning of the word "constitution."[54] This conflation can be seen clearly in Gandhi's declaration that Natal's disenfranchisement of Indians "is repugnant to the British constitution and the British sense of justice and fairplay [sic], and above all hateful to the spirit of Christianity."[55] Gandhi seamlessly merged the British Constitution with an innate British "sense" of justice and Christian values. According to a petition from Transvaal Indian subjects, the Afrikaner government was "unconstitutional and tyrannical misgovernment: contrary in letter and spirit to the British Constitution, to its statutes and to its benign policy, the

---

Africa: Deputation to Lord Crewe: (Special Report for 'India'): A Long and Squalid Story," *India*, 5 December 1913; British Indians in Cape Town to SSI, n.d. [received 23/3/1905], BL/IOR/ L/PJ/713, File 753.

[53] Uday Singh Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth Century British Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

[54] See chapter one.

[55] M. K. Gandhi, *The Indian Franchise: An Appeal To every Briton in South Africa* (Durban: T. L. Cullingworth, December 1895), 21.

outcome of generations of *world* experience."[56] Contrasting Afrikaner "tyranny" with British imperialists' "generations of *world* experience," these petitioners argued that the British government's cosmopolitanism and fairness were part of its "spirit," a sense of how to rule justly that was both innate and developed through centuries of imperial rule.[57] To declare anti-Indian laws to be against the British constitution was both to make a political statement and to imply that such laws were fundamentally opposed to the British character. Such rhetoric put white settlers, rather than Indian activists, on the wrong side of the law. In defense of their embrace of passive or active resistance, diasporic Indians argued that the greater crime lay in racist legislation that contravened the political foundations of the empire.[58] In this iteration, racist colonists, rather than Indian activists, became the troublesome colonial subjects threatening imperial unity and betraying imperial principles.

Some observers compared colonial legislators to other countries, notably Britain's enemies and rivals such as Russia or Germany. Given their un-British actions, perhaps settler colonies were not really part of the British Empire, but were foreign entities with values inimical to Britain and the true empire.[59] The British financial paper *The Statist* simply observed, "anti-Asiatics are England's foes."[60] J. E. Bird, the defense lawyer for the *Komagata Maru* passengers, described the Canadian immigration officials as "little

[56] Annexure to the Petition, Annex A, "Notice, 18 November 1902 to Colonial-born Subjects, Natives of India, in the Transvaal," TNA CO 291/61, Transvaal No 14411. For other British constitution quotes, see: Aiyar, *Indian Problem*, 23; "£3 License and Indian Women," *AC*, 25 February 1911; Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, quoted in *India*, quoted in "Sir William Wedderburn and the East India Association: Special Report," *IO*, 16 July 1903.
[57] This statement also played into pre-existing rhetoric contrasting Afrikaner and British imperial rule which cast the British as superior moral imperialists, while the Afrikaners ran amok with unthinking racism. See chapter three.
[58] TBIA, quoted in "The Transvaal Press on the Asiatic Act: A Reply," *IO*, 6 July 1907; "The Home Rule Struggle," *IO*, 19 November 1913.
[59] "this so-called part of the British Empire" in "The Proposed Indian Commission," *CIN*, 27 September 1902.
[60] *Statist*, quoted in "Late News: Special Telegrams," *IO*, 2 November 1907.

Czars…'Are we in Russia'? [sic]…is what I feel like saying half the time before the Immigration Department here—are we in Russia[?] It is the most autocratic, the most undemocratic of our institutions. They talk about socialists and anarchists…There is no set of anarchists in Canada like the Immigration Officials, who defy all law and order."[61] Bizarrely, Bird, himself a socialist, combined all the Russian political bugbears—czarism, socialism, and anarchism—in one contradictory simile designed to terrify the Canadian public. The idea of immigration officers as Russian autocrats[62] gave way during World War I to denigration of immigration departments' "Hun" tactics and principles.[63] The particular country being targeted shifted depending on British political alliances, but the concept of colonial legislators as foreign enemy agents, destroying the empire from within, remained constant. According to this portrayal, anti-Indian legislation was symptomatic of colonists' foreign values, and perhaps of their foreign racial and national make-up. Anti-Indian legislation was thus not only anti-imperial but un-British.

These racialized arguments against colonial anti-Indian legislation, which depicted colonists as un-British, un-civilized, and anti-imperial, directly impacted those colonies' claims to self-government. Britishness, like imperial citizenship, was a

---

[61] Bird, quoted in "Minutes of a Hindu Mass Meeting Held in Dominion Hall, Vancouver, June 21, 1914," LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, part 3. For more anarchist comparisons, see also: night lettergram, Umrao Singh (secretary United India League Khalsa Diwan) to Borden, 22 June 1914, LAC BP OC 196 (2)-OC 196 (6), MG26, H 1(a), Volume 40; Husein Rahim, quoted in "Minutes of a Hindu Mass Meeting Held in Dominion Hall, Vancouver, June 21, 1914," LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, part 3; "Plea for Transferring Jurisdiction on Immigration Matters to Duly Constituted Courts of Justice," *Hindustanee*, January 1914. It is interesting to note that all these accusations came from activists whom police and immigration officials labeled as socialists, anarchists, or radicals.

[62] "Mass Meeting: Protest against Imprisonment and Persecution," *AC*, 25 July 1908; "The March of the Two Thousand," *India*, November 14, 1913; "Editorial: Welcome to Komagata Maru," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.

[63] "Conscripting the Hindu," Newspaper clipping, n.d., LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 10; N*atal Advertiser Echoes,* quoted in "Immigration Regulations," *IV*, 25 September 1914; "An unworthy attack," *AC*, 4 March 1916.

discourse with profound political and legal effects. Declarations that anti-Indian legislation was un-British did not just assert Indian rights to racial equality, they also utilized racial hierarchies in an attempt to disenfranchise white settlers. These conversations unsettled the boundaries of whiteness and self-government by undermining European settlers' racial credentials and, by extension, their political rights. Chapter three examines in more depth how debates around Britishness were part of a wider conversation around the racial boundaries of whiteness. With their understanding of British law and culture and their very whiteness called into question, white colonists' right to self-government came ever more under attack. What the limits of self-government within the empire were and who deserved self-government, were crucial questions that emerged as Indians and colonial settlers came head to head over the question of anti-Indian immigration restriction. That these questions were intricately intertwined with racial, class, and gender markers is clearly explicated in the following section.

A troubled family: Familial metaphors, self-government, and tensions within the British empire

Family immigration became a catalyst for political action in both Canada and South Africa. In both places, immigration laws introduced in the 1910s either explicitly or de facto prevented wives and children from rejoining their husbands. Activists argued that these laws destroyed "natural" family bonds and threatened the heterosexual, patriarchal, and racial order. While supporters of immigration restriction raised the specter of rapidly reproducing brown bodies overwhelming the white population, opponents of restrictive laws utilized fears of miscegeny, implying that if denied access

to Indian women, male migrants might turn to white women instead. These laws and their impact of Indian families were used to justify political activism in print and in passive resistance. In particular, activists focused on the threat that such laws posed to Indian men's masculinity (expressed in terms of sexual needs) and the insult to Indian women's honor (posed in terms of sexual purity).[64] Scholars such as Radhika Mongia, Enakshi Dua, and Kalpana Hiralal have analyzed the role of women as both object and subject in the opposition to immigration restriction.[65] In this section, however, I have focused instead on the rhetoric surrounding not Indian families, but the British empire as family. This allows me to explore the complex interaction of gender and race in conceptions of imperial citizenship.

Metaphors of the British Empire as a family addressed the question of self-government within imperial hierarchies through racialized and gendered language. Sukanya Banerjee suggests that discourses of imperial citizenship used the "metaphor of familiality" and alludes to some of the racialized and gendered overtones of that metaphor.[66] However, she does not give much attention to the full richness of this metaphor's multi-varied use. The familial metaphor reveals how completely self-government was dependent on one's status as adult male. While the metaphor of empire as a family relied on tropes of "mother" Britannia and the "daughter" colonies, the individuals in those countries struggled to assert their masculinity, a prerequisite for

[64] Dua, "Racialising Imperial Canada"; Shah, *Stranger Intimacy*, esp. 209-219; A. Chessel Piquet, "Indian Women and the Struggle," *IO*, 8 Feburary 1908; N. M. Joshi, "Correspondence: A Message to the Indian Women of the Transvaal," *IO*, 4 December 1909.
[65] Radhika Mongia, "Gender and the Historiography of Gandhian *Satyagraha* in South Africa," *Gender and History* 18, no. 1 (April 2006): 130-149; Dua, "Racialising Imperial Canada"; Kalpana Hiralal, "Rethinking Gender and Agency in the Satyagraha Movement of 1913," *Journal of Social Sciences*, 25 (2010): 71-80; Kalpana Hiralal "'Our Plucky sisters who have dared to fight': Indian Women and the Satyagraha movement in South Africa," *The Oriental Anthropologist*, 9, no. 1 (2009): 1-22; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, chapter 13.
[66] Banerjee, *Becoming*, 3, 62-64.

imperial (or national) citizenship. Familial metaphors with their ties to genealogy and inheritance played with ideas of racial consanguinity and navigated the contradictions inherent in ideal of imperial unity. These metaphors could be used to bring parts of the empire closer together or to position certain parts as beyond the pale, to express the grave danger of intra-imperial rifts[67] or to minimize their impact.[68] Above all, the metaphor of the family appeared to emphasize affection, similarity, and union within the empire while utilizing (and obscuring) the hierarchies of power on which both the family and the imperial unit rested. The complex possibilities of familial relationships proved a potent, flexible metaphor for the fraught and ever-changing position of the self-governing colonies and India within the empire.

Parent-child metaphors perfectly encapsulated tensions between Britain, India and the self-governing colonies, expressing political difficulties in a familiar setting while (supposedly) emphasizing affective and biological bonds between the disparate parts of empire. The connections between childhood and self-government were part of a long-established liberal tradition dating back as far as John Locke. According to Locke, tutelage was a necessary part of childhood during which coercion by the parental figure was necessary and beneficial, since the child yet lacked the rational capability necessary to assent to contractual government.[69] As Uday Singh Mehta masterfully demonstrates, nineteenth century British liberals used this argument to permanently disenfranchise

---

[67] *Western Mercury*, quoted in "Stoppage of Indentured: British Press Opinion," *IO*, 18 February 1911; William R. Pringle (Toronto) to Laurier, 14 October 1906, LAC LP, Series A, Correspondence, Volume 429, pgs. 114749 to 114752, Microfilm Reel C-839.

[68] L. Gabriel, quoted in "The Native Unrest: The Natal Indians' Offer," *IO*, 28 April 1906; *Collier's Weekly*, quoted in "'The Canadian Collier's' Sympathy with the Hindu Brothers," *Aryan,* October 1911; Maharajah of Nawanagar, quoted in Pachai, *International Aspects*, 98-9.

[69] Mehta, *Liberalism*, 32, 59-60. Locke's description of how to properly educate future citizens included toilet training, what to wear, what to eat, and how to express emotion, in addition to intellectual education (Mehta, *Liberalism*, 60-1). Unsurprisingly, many of these behaviors, particularly dress and food, were used to police Indian other non-whites' exclusion from citizenship.

Indians. John Mill pere et fils, Thomas Babington Macaulay, and Charles Trevelyan depicted Indians as children in order to justify imperial coercion by the parental British empire.[70] The metaphor of childhood, in the hands of British liberals, was meant to indicate that Indians were always-becoming but never-quite British citizens.[71] But what happened to that metaphor of familial relations in the hands of Indian nationalists?

The language of manhood and adulthood were potent components of Indian nationalist claims to self-government in the subcontinent, as well as assertions of imperial citizenship throughout the empire. Indian nationalists claimed their own rights of self-government on the grounds that

> "We decline longer to be treated as a pack of children, a race of savages, or a class of helots…We demand the breadth of treatment due to men entitled to be free, entitled to the treatment of civilised free men, entitled to the treatment of people worthy to be citizens of an important Empire…We claim as a right not as a favour, the elementary rights of civilised British citizens.'"[72]

Imperial citizenship, like self-government, meant being considered "civilized men" rather than "children" or "savages." The family metaphor offered Indian nationalists the perfect opportunity with which to compare their qualifications for imperial citizenship with white settlers. While utilizing the parent-child metaphor to counter white settler aggression by insisting that the British "parent" discipline white settler colonies, Indian nationalists simultaneously challenged their categorization as children undeserving of self-government.

Indian commentators took the metaphor of childhood so often used in arguments against Indian enfranchisement and turned it against white colonial settlers. Depicting the

---

[70] Mehta, *Liberalism*, 31-2, 70-5.
[71] Mehta, *Liberalism*, 33, 162; Banerjee, *Becoming*, 7; Mohanram, *Imperial White*, 12.
[72] "Mass Meeting: Mr. Gandhi's Exhortation 'Be ready by New Year's Day': Commission Criticised," *AC,* 27 December 1913.

Dominions as children or "baby-colonies" served to bolster Indian claims that white settlers were not yet ready for self-government and were likely to abuse the power given to them under responsible government (see below).[73] References to the Transvaal as "the youngest of her [Britain's] children" carried connotations of immaturity, while alluding to Afrikaners' recent attempts in the Anglo-Boer War *not* to belong to the empire.[74] *Indian Opinion* informed readers that the "Daughter Nations" were bound by the "moral contracts" which "the Mother of us all" had entered into (i.e., to protect Indian subjects) and that the colonies must abide by those obligations as long as "they choose to remain within the Imperial household."[75] Being a member of the empire brought privileges, but in return for those benefits, colonists had to uphold imperial honor and welfare.[76] This rhetoric obliquely evoked the disciplinary power of the British "mother" while cloaking such power in the language of contractual choice and parental protection.

Diasporic Indians under the thumb of colonial governments frequently invoked the coercive power of the imperial government in their own defense. *Indian Opinion* stated outright that Britain was "false to the best and dearest interests of the Empire when it panders to the brutal follies of its spoilt child, the Transvaal."[77] This accusation neatly laid the blame on both Britain and the colonies, criticizing Britain's inadequate discipline

[73] "Canada's Asiatic Problem," *IO*, 16 May 1908; "Home Rule for India," *IO,* 2 September 1905; "Empire Day," *IO*, 30 May 1908.
[74] "Home Rule for India," *IO,* 2 September 1905. See also: Secretary of the Hornsey Trades Council, quoted in "Meeting at Caxton Hall: Huge Success: Expressions of Sympathy: Special to Indian Opinion," *IO*, 8 February 1908.
[75] "The 'Colonial' Conference," *IO*, 27 April 1907. See also: *Indian Patriot* (Madras), quoted in "Opinion in India: On The Transvaal Struggle," *IO*, 28 November 1908; H. A. Wadia, quoted in "Bombay Meeting; Colonial Hostility Strongly Condemned; The Closed Door," *IO*, 21 September 1912.
[76] "India Makes the Empire," *IO*, 20 August 1904; Gokhale, quoted in *Times,* quoted in "The Position of Indians in the Empire: The Transvaal Trouble a Cause of Indian Unrest," *IO*, 15 October 1910; Elizabeth Ross Grace, quoted in Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 377.
[77] "An imperial Insult," *IO,* 29 May 1909. See also: The Immigration Petition," *IO*, 31 August 1907; "Mr. Smuts' [sic] Eulogium of the Empire," *AC,* 13 August 1910; "The True-Born Englishman," *IO*, 1 May 1909.

and disparaging the Transvaal for being a spoilt child. In speaking about relationship between liberalism and imperial fantasies, Mehta points out, almost in passing, that familial discipline could be harsher and less restricted than that of the state.[78] The paterfamilias' power was hierarchical and disciplinary but the domesticity of that power masked its violence.[79] The familial metaphor thus normalized and minimized the (ab)use of power by Britain--abuse that becomes acceptable use because it is in the hands of the parental figure. Those authors who used the familial metaphor to describe imperial relationships did not shy away from the coercion of those relationships; rather, the metaphor allowed them to normalize and condone some forms of violence while criticizing others. An *Indian Opinion* correspondent pitied Britain for being uncertain "whether to accede to the strenuous demands of his own unruly children or wipe away the tears of his adopted child, India. He is almost in a fix; and yet his ungrateful children continue to anger him and try to extract some more tears from the crying child by his side. It does not matter for them whether India lives or dies, or whether the Empire stands or falls."[80] Like other quotations, this blamed colonists for oppressing Indians, stressing the parent country, and threatening the entire imperial family's future. The metaphor of "adoption" disguised the violence of British conquest of India, while still marking the discriminatory exclusion of Indians from empire by the settler colonies. The racial hierarchy of empire was expressed in the analogy of adopted versus biological children. This passage emphasized the need for Britain to intervene on Indians' behalf and to control the "unruly" behavior of white settlers. The disciplinary violence of Mother

[78] Mehta, *Liberalism*, 33.
[79] Thus, J. R. Seeley preferred the mother-child metaphor because "Empire seems too military and despotic" (Seeley, quoted in Banerjee, *Becoming*, 62).
[80] Indiana [pseud.], "Correspondence: Where will it End?" *IO*, 8 April 1905.

Britannia was not only condoned but solicited, while the disobedient violence of sibling colonies had to be condemned and controlled.

Familial metaphors used the language of genealogy to trace affective and racial connections and divides. In a culture obsessed with race, genealogy, and evolution, the claim that Indians were siblings to white British colonists carried weighty racial connotations. The *Montreal Witness* made this explicit in their statement that Sikh immigrants to Canada were "'doubly our sisters, as Aryans and as British subjects.'"[81] At the same time, Teja Singh acknowledged the difficulty in getting white settlers to recognize this racial consanguinity, telling readers in British Columbia that "the East Indians are her brothers, or at least first cousins."[82] Made most explicit by Sikh Punjabis who emphasized their Aryan heritage (see chapter three), the sibling metaphor nonetheless carried racial connotations even when invoked by South Africans of Tamil and Gujarati descent.

While for some, familial metaphors evoked shared racial heritage, others used the extended family to emphasize affective and racial distance between members of the empire. Indian nationalists argued that India was treated as an adopted child, a foster-

[81] *Montreal Witness*, quoted in Isabella Ross Broad, *An Appeal for Fair Play for the Sikhs in Canada* (1913). See chapter three for arguments about the "Aryan family."

[82] "Teja Singh: The Scholarly Gentle Sikh who has Solved the Hindu Problem of Canada: By Harold Franklin: [From Collier's Weekly]," *IO*, 9 May 1909. See also *African Chronicle*'s acknowledgement that that the family metaphor doesn't work for India, Egypt and parts of South Africa "which have had very little, proportionately, of the Mother-blood in their veins" and that the true ideal of empire is that of a business partnership in which each member rules his own house but they collaborate for mutual advantage ("The expansion of Britain's Imperial relations," *AC,* 19 June 1915). The *Times* envisioned a halfway house between family and business model, settling on the image of the empire as a medieval "fortified enceinte" within which Empire there are many houses, each inhabited by its own family. These households have common interests, but each manages its own affairs—wisely or unwisely—without interference from others'" (*Times* (6 December), quoted in *India* (12 December), quoted in "Hindustanee View of Colonies and Empire," *Hindustanee*, January 1914).

child or a stepchild, evoking images of neglect, favoritism, and abuse.[83] References to India as the "Cinderella of empire," European culture's most famously abused stepchild, were common.[84] However, Indians were not the only non-biological members of the British imperial family. Bhownaggree characterized Afrikaners' difference from Britain by describing them as "step-children of empire."[85] While descriptions of Indians as step-children emphasized their mistreatment and alienation from empire, marking Afrikaners as step-children underlined their inability to truly belong to the empire. Their status as step-children was due as to their racist disregard for Indian subjects as well as to their national/racial difference from the British. Even British settlers could betray their heritage and become "un-British," through the degenerative descent of colonization. According to one Canadian supporter of Indian immigration, the colonial "daughters are not like the Motherland" in their treatment of Indian immigrants.[86] These familial metaphors and the political lessons contained in them exemplify how Indian criticisms of colonial self-government expressed itself in both political and racialized terms. Familial metaphors connected racialized ideas of un-Britishness to qualifications for self-government.

Immigration restriction: From imperial citizenship to self-government

White colonists who supported immigration restriction often argued—in contrast to Indian assertions explored below—that imperial citizenship did not carry rights of free

[83] "Result of Imperial Conference," *AC,* 1 July 1911; Aga Khan, quoted in *AC,* 20 December 1913; "Mr. Lyttelton on the Indians in the Transvaal," *IO*, 8 April 1905; "The Transvaal Constitution," *IO*, 6 May 1905.
[84] Rao Bahadur M. Audinarayaniah, quoted in "Mass Meeting at Madras: Conclusion of Report," *IO*, 27 November 1909; "The Cinderella of the Empire," *IO,* 30 July 1903; "India's Service to the Empire," *IO*, 15 October 1903; "'The Pivot of the Empire,'" *IO*, 20 May 1905.
[85] Quoted in *India*, quoted in "The Caxton Hall Meeting: Indignation Against the Transvaal: Strong Resolutions," *IO*, 21 November 1908.
[86] E. R. Grace, quoted in "Canada Condemns Color," *Aryan*, July 1912. See also: *Glasgow Herald*, quoted in "What is a British citizen?: Imperial Conference's Decision," *IO*, 22 July 1911.

migration within the empire[87] or that the rights of the self-governing colonies to determine their demographic and political make-up was more important than Indians' rights of imperial citizenship.[88] Colonial politicians often asserted their right to exclude Indians, even if it meant overruling the British government.[89] Richard Jebb argued that the Transvaal should "seced[e] from the Empire for half-an-hour…rejoining on the conclusion of a pre-arranged treaty establishing the right of the Colonists to exclude British Indians.'"[90] Ironically, Jebb, one of the major proponents of imperial union, advocated colonial secession in order to allow racial discrimination within the empire. The Afrikaner nationalist J. B. M. Hertzog took this argument even further, stating that there was no Imperial Government, merely the five self-governing Dominions on equal terms with Britain and that "The whole policy of Imperialism was a policy of closer union, nothing else."[91] Imperial politicians increasingly agreed that they could not force any particular laws upon the Dominions.[92] In the 1890s and early 1900s, the imperial government helped the Dominions adapt legislation that offered de facto restriction expressed in ostensibly non-racial terms in order to protect the idea of imperial

[87] Lord Selborne, quoted in Reuter report (London, February 19), quoted in "Imperial Parliament: Transvaal Indians," *AC,* 24 February 1912; "A Standing Imperial Difficulty," *Sunderland Daily* Echo" quoted in *AC,* 22 March 1913; Mr. Fisher, quoted in "Union Parliament: Immigrant's Restriction Bill," *AC,* 3 May 1913.

[88] Ramsay Macdonald, quoted in (Bombay), quoted in Reuters (London, 3 January), quoted in *AC,* 17 January 1914; Louis Botha, quoted in "News in Brief," *IO*, 3 May 1913; *Canada: Report of Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King on his Mission to England in Connection with the Immigration of Asiatics into Canada. Presented to Parliament June 1908*. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, Darling & Son, Ltd., 1908), CD 4118, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 3.

[89] Frank Oliver, quoted in "Public No. 152 India Office, enclosure debate in Canadian House of Commons on Asiatic Immigration, 1 June 1914," BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1395, File 3277. See also: Certified copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council 6 April 1911, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 3; "British Indians in the Transvaal," *IO*, 14 January 1905; Hamar Greenwood (MP for Sutherland) quoted in "The Week's Telegrams: Outside Interference--A Canadian's Comment," *India*, 28 November 1913.

[90] Jebb, quoted in *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in "Transvaal Press," *IO*, 30 March 1907.

[91] "Hertzog's Imperialism," *AC,* 5 September 1913.

[92] Colonial Office to All-India Moslem League, June 1914, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1395, File 3277; Edwin Montagu, quoted in "B. C. Hindus and the British Parliament," *Aryan*, July 1912; Alfred Milner to SSC, 18 April 1904, TNA CO 291/70, Transvaal No. 16319; John Morley, quoted in "The Transvaal Deputation: Mr. Morley's Views: Still Hope," *IO*, 1 December 1906.

citizenship.[93] However, by the 1911 Imperial Conference, the Secretary of State for the Colonies openly disavowed the principle that imperial citizenship guaranteed free migration within the empire, stating that the Dominions had the right to exclude, not only aliens, but British subjects. With this declaration, the imperial government admitted that the rights of self-government trumped ideas of a unifying imperial citizenship.[94]

Indian opponents of immigration restriction refused to accept this principle. The vision of federated white states that Alfred Milner and his disciples championed seemed a pretty poor imperialism to Indians.[95] Indian National Congress leader Sachchidananda Sinha stated, in his capacity as member of the Governor-General's Council, that without the "sound and healthy ideal of citizenship" of *civis Britannicus sum*, "the Empire will be reduced to a mere agglomeration of States and the nominal allegiance to the Crown will not be sufficient to stop its disintegration."[96] More radical Ghadr Party member Husain Rahim argued in his Vancouver newspaper *The Hindustanee* that "These colonies have become so autonomous that the British Empire is but a myth, a sickly sentiment, which is being realized more and more each day by Hindustanees in all practical political

---

[93] Huttenback, "White Man's Country," 111-7; Kondapi, *Indians Overseas*, 193; Allen, "'Innocents abroad,'" 114; Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 97-9; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 128, 146; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 37-8; Milner to SSC, 18 April 1904, TNA CO 291/70, Transvaal No. 16319; Milner to SSC, CONFIDENTIAL, 18 April 1904, TAB GOV LEER Volume 662, Ref 15/04.

[94] Sinha, "Strange Death," 35-8; Karatani, *Defining*, 75; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 28; speech given to Governor General's Council published in the *Gazette of India*, 19 September 1914, *Immigration From India to the Self-Governing Dominions: Summary of a Speech by the Viceroy of India, September 8, 1914* (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1915), pp. 963-998, LAC BP OC 196 (2)-OC 196 (6), MG26, H 1(a), Volume 40.

[95] Frost, "Colonial Public Sphere," 91. For an examination of Milner's imperialism and its racial and national limits, see: Andrea Bosco and Alex May, eds, *The Round Table: the Empire-Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy* (London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997). For Indian critiques of a whites-only federated empire, see: "Home Rule All Around," *AC,* 22 October 1910; "Result of Imperial Conference," *AC,* 1 July 1911; petition, Natal Indians to Joseph Chamberlain, 27 March 1897, GLDC HIST 1906/1914.

[96] Sachchidananda Sinha, quoted in *Proceeding of the Council of the Governor General of India….25 February 1910, pp.* 276, TAB GOV LEER Volume 1234, Ref 15/2/24/1910. See also: "From the Editor's Chair: The Debate in the Lords," *IO*, 6 September 1913; petition from Hindu Friend Society of Victoria to SSC, 28 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; Bhownaggree, reported in "Indians in London: Meeting at Caxton Hall: (Special Report for 'India'): Indians and The Overseas Dominions," *India,* 26 June 1914.

questions affecting them in the colonies."[97] While Sinha attempted to save the empire by reinforcing the ideal of imperial citizenship, Rahim celebrated diasporic Indians' growing awareness that the empire was "but a myth." What is striking, however, is the extent to which Indians of all political backgrounds agreed that white federation spelled the downfall of the empire. Both Indian nationalists and their British supporters argued that the interests of empire required intervention when imperial citizenship was threatened, regardless of settler colonies' putative rights of self-government.[98]

The imperial government's refusal to defend Indian rights of imperial citizenship in the self-governing colonies was interpreted as evidence either of its lack of sympathy for Indian subjects' suffering or of its inability to control the self-governing colonies.[99] *India* characterized the imperial government's response as "Expressions of helplessness, coupled with scarcely veiled indifference."[100] British indifference was bad enough, but if the government was *unable* to protect Indians in the self-governing colonies that had even more dangerous implications for the empire. Indian periodicals routinely described the imperial government as "powerless,"[101] "impotent,"[102] even "cowardly."[103] A

---

[97] "Our Benevolent Advisers," *Hindustanee*, May 1914.
[98] Sir Pherozeshah Mehta, reported in "What Indians Want: Mass Meeting at Bombay: Indians in South Africa," *India*, 3 October 1913; Bhownaggree, quoted in "Indian Deputation to Lord Crewe: Sir M. M. Bhownaggree's Speech: A Long Squalid Sufferings," *IO*, 31 December 1913; "Notes and Comments," *AC*, 31 October 1908; Ampthill, quoted in "Debate in the House of Lords: The Asiatic Ordinance," *IO*, 29 June 1907.
[99] "Statement by the Natal Indian Congress on the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Restriction (Further Provision) Bill, 1925," in *The South African Indian. Helot or Citizen?* (Indians Overseas Association, [January 1926]), 19-20.
[100] *India*, quoted in "The Indians in South Africa," *CIN,* 5 July 1901. See also:
telegram, British Indians in Kimberley to Selborne, 18 March 1909, TAB GOV LEER Volume 1193, Ref 15/1/34/1909; "From the Editor's Chair: Our Sincere Regret," *AC,* 1 November 1913; Dadabhai Naoroji, quoted in "News in Brief," *IO*, 26 November 1913; Babu Ambica Charan Mazumdar, quoted in "Great Meeting in Calcutta," *IO*, 14 January 1914.
[101] Sir Wedderburn, quoted in *India,* quoted in "Indians in the Transvaal: Their Grievances as British Citizens: Sir William Wedderburn and the East India Association; Special Report," *IO*, 9 July 1903; Bhussmasoor [pseud.], "Notes on Current Topics," *AC,* 18 July 1908; Chairman of the Nyasaland Indian meeting 12 March, quoted in "Nyasaland and the Transvaal: Then and Now; Special to Indian Opinion," *IO*, 24 April 1909; also quoted in *AC,* 1 May 1909.

correspondent for the *South African Observer* castigated the Imperial Government for "dodging the issue, instead of manfully facing it."[104] Such accusations impugned the British government's power and masculinity.

Using racialized and gendered language, Indian opponents of immigration restriction contrasted the British government's laziness or weakness with Indian immigrants' ingenuity, tenacity, and bravery. Rahim compared the Government of India's inaction to the "fakir-fatalism" of those who beg for their meal and say it's "Kismet" if they do not get enough. He used stereotypes of indolent and hyper-religious Indians to denigrate the Government of India's refusal to challenge Canadian immigration restriction.[105] According to Rahim, Indians in Canada had "demonstrated more capability on this question than the Bureaucracy of India…they went after it, found that the holes in the 'Order-in-Council' and 'direct journey' clause could be punched."[106] In this example, Indian settlers showed more resourcefulness and capacity for good government than either the lazy and indifferent British Raj or racist settlers who instituted unconstitutional laws. Similarly, an *Indian Opinion* editorial expressed its pity "for the Imperial Government which is imperial only in name and which in reality is the slave of

---

[102] Observer [pseud.], "Notes and Comments: Impotence of British Raj," *AC,* 9 July 1910; *Parsi*, quoted in "Public Opinion in India: On the South African Question: 'The Parsi,' *IO*, 13 November 1909; telegram, Natal Indians to Colonial Secretary Pietermaritzburg, 11 January 1908, NAB CSO 1849, Ref 223/1908; Jehangir Bomanjee Petit, quoted in "Great Meeting at Bombay (Concluded)" *IO*, 11 February 1914.
[103] *Pall Mall Gazette*, quoted in *S. A. News,* quoted "Cowardly Desertion," *IO*, 14 September 1907. See also: Abdool Rahman (26 April 1905) "Correspondence: The Transvaal Constitution and British Indians," *IO*, 6 May 1905; "General Notes and News," *AC,* 6 February 1909; Typescript copy of report of meeting at Sikh temple Vancouver 10 January 1914, VCA, H. H. Stevens Papers [henceforth SP], 509-D-7 file 1.
[104] F. Z. S. P. in *South African Spectator,* quoted in "The Indian in South Africa," *IO*, 5 August 1905.
[105] "Fatalism Infects Government of India," *Hindustanee*, February 1914. See also: "'The Indian People,'" *IO*, 16 July 1904; Bhownaggree at London mass meeting October 16, quoted in *India,* quoted in "The Caxton Hall Meeting: Indignation Against the Transvaal: Strong Resolutions," *IO*, 21 November 1908.
[106] "Fatalism Infects Government of India," *Hindustanee*, February 1914.

any bully of a colony which has sufficient audacity to dictate to it."[107] *Indian Opinion* compared this to the Indian passive resisters who refused to be treated as slaves and were vindicating their national and individual honor. These articles took traditional racist imagery of Indians as effeminate or slothful weaklings and turned that gendered and racialized logic against the imperial and colonial governments. Such rhetoric implicitly argued for Indian rights of self-government, while explicitly criticizing the British government for their "un-British" embrace of anti-Indian legislation.

By the early 1900s, as Indians were forced to recognize that Britain privileged self-government over imperial citizenship, they shifted tactics, agitating for imperial intervention in those colonies which did not yet have self-government. This came to the fore particularly in 1902 to 1907 as the Transvaal transitioned from an independent Afrikaner Republic to a self-governing British colony in the wake of the second Anglo-Boer War. While the Transvaal was still under direct control by the Colonial Office, Transvaal Indians, backed by Natal Indian supporters, agitated constantly to get their grievances addressed, knowing that after the grant of self-government, the British government would say it was powerless to address their requests.[108] *India* emphasized the time pressure on the imperial government to intervene, saying, "if it will be difficult to alter [these laws] when once self-government is set up in the annexed territories, how necessary is it to lose no time in repairing what is amiss while we still have the power."[109] Here, *India* grudgingly accepted the argument that self-governing colonies were immune

---

[107] "From the Editor's Chair: The Royal Assent"*," IO*, 21 June 1913. See also: "From the Editor's Chair: Painted Laths and Uriah Heep," *IO*, 29 October 1910; Jamsetji, quoted in "Bombay Public Meeting: Colonial Hostility Strongly Condemned," *IO,* 14 September 1912.
[108] *Indian Mirror,* quoted in "Indians in South Africa," *IO*, 11 February 1905.
[109] *India*, quoted in "British Indians in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies," *CIN,* 15 November 1902. See also: *India*, quoted in "The Indian Grievances in South Africa and the Urgency of Redress," *CIN,* 11 October 1902.

from imperial interference in order to exert more pressure on the British government to address its responsibility for Indian subjects while it still could.[110] The problem surfaced again as the South African colonies prepared for Union in 1910. South African Indians, as well as the Cape Coloured and black populations, worried that after Union the British government would plead inability to interfere and the non-white populations of South Africa would be left completely unprotected.[111] Elite Indians with limited rights in the Cape Colony and in Natal worried that they would lose those rights as individual provincial laws were brought into line with a Union policy based on that of the Afrikaner republics.[112] *African Chronicle* contended that the British government used the Union to "shake off its responsibility for them [Indians] under the presence of the Divine Right of self-governing colonies."[113] The sarcastic reference to "Divine Right" reveals Indians' reluctance to accept the theory of non-intervention in self-governing colonies. When they did so, it was often a strategic capitulation designed to put pressure on the imperial government to intervene where they still "could."[114]

---

[110] Imperial politicians, unsurprisingly, responded that since the Transvaal was on track to become self-governing, it would be impolitic to enforce unpopular laws (Oliver Lyttelton, quoted in *India*, quoted in "Imperial Parliament: British Indians and the 'Colour Bar,'" *IO*, 19 January 1907; Winston Churchill, quoted in *Natal Mercury,* quoted in "In the Imperial Parliament: Sympathy for Indian Grievances: Indians for Transvaal Mines," *IO*, 31 March 1906; Milner to SSC CONFIDENTIAL, 18 April 1904, TAB GOV LEER Volume 662, Ref 15/04.

[111] Indians, as well as Cape Coloured, fought hard to ensure that their rights were protected in the Union Constitution and upon losing this battle, Indians followed Abdurahman's proposal that Union day should be a day of mourning rather than celebration for the coloured population of South Africa (Observer [pseud.], "Notes on Current Topics: A Very Bold Step," *AC,* 7 May 1910; "Our Royal Visitors," *AC,* 3 December 1910; "Anxious Figure," *AC,* 3 December 1910.

[112] "Closer Union," *IO*, 17 October 1908; "Act of Union: An unholy measure," *AC,* 20 February 1909; "Deputation to India and England," *AC*, 19 June 1909; Bhussmasoor [pseud.], "Correspondence," *IO*, 19 July 1909; "A. P. O. Conference Resolution," *AC*, 26 March 1910; "What Union Means to Coloured People: Indians and Coloured People have no Cause to Rejoice," *IO*, 11 June 1910.

[113] "Who is Responsible for the Indian?: None," *AC,* 27 February 1909. See also: TBIA to Curzon, 27 February 1909, BL MSS EUR F112/79.

[114] Once South Africa was self-governing, Indians turned their attention to other colonies still under direct British control, such as British East Africa, as places where they ought to still be protected (Gregory, *East Africa*, esp. chapters five through nine; Aiyar, "Empire, Race, and the Indians." See for example: "Indians

Indian opponents of immigration restriction fiercely debated amongst themselves whether unrestricted freedom of movement was in fact an inalienable right of citizenship or whether immigration restriction on non-racial lines was permissible. Some asserted that freedom of movement and settlement without restriction was a principle of imperial citizenship.[115] Bhownaggree described the right of entry to British colonies as "the first and elementary right of a British subject."[116] Supporters of this position associated the right of free travel with the glorious and noble traditions of the British Empire. The Roman principle of *civis Romanus sum*, re-imagined as *civis Britannicus sum*, guaranteed free and safe passage throughout the British world.[117] This phrase also referred to the mid-century speech of the Foreign Minister Palmerston which justified a trade embargo against Greece in retaliation for an attack by Greek nationalists on a British subject. Indians and British alike invoked this speech to threaten the self-governing colonies with imperial retaliation—if Britain had been willing to risk war with a foreign nation to protect its subjects, then surely, Indian advocates argued, it should be willing to discipline

---

in British East Africa," *AC,* 15 October 1910; "From the Editor's Chair: British Indians in Zanzibar," *IO*, 23 July 1910.

[115] Sunder Singh (28 December 1911), quoted in "The Sikhs in Canada," *Aryan*, January 1912; Swadesh Sevak petition, n.d. [meeting held 24 April 1910], LAC LP, Series A, Correspondence, Volume 687, pg 187864 to 18766, Volume 687, pg 187951 to 187973; Pherozeshah Mehta, quoted in "What Indians Want: Indians in South Africa," *India*, 3 October 1913.

[116] "Indians in London: Meeting at Caxton Hall: (Special Report for 'India'): Indians and The Overseas Dominions," *India*, 26 June 1914. See also: Telegrams: Allahabad Imperialism," *Bengalee*, 29 May 1914; *The Nation*, quoted in "Notes and News," *India*, 17 July 1914. A Canadian official lamented that amongst Indians in British Columbia "The argument of free emigration to Canada as British subjects has been accepted by all; reasons to the contrary, if mentioned, are cleverly distorted as unjust and oppressive" ([Herbert C. Clogstoun] *Report* [1914], 29).

[117] Sachchidananda Sinha, quoted in *Proceeding of the Council of the Governor General of India….25 February 1910, p.* 276, TAB GOV LEER Volume 1234, 15/2/24/1910; Indu Prakas Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration" (MA Thesis, University of Nebraska, Department of Economics and Commerce, May 1915), 63; *Empire*, quoted in "What the British Press Say," *IO*, 19 December 1908; *Canada*, quoted in "Citizenship of the Empire," *IO*, 16 January 1909; Besant, quoted in *Beharee,* quoted in "'Sons of India': Are they Citizens of the Empire?" *IO*, 19 June 1909; Sir Charles Bruce, quoted in "Sir Charles Bruce on the Transvaal Crisis," *AC*, 28 November 1908; Wilfred Laurier and Winston Churchill, quoted in *Times* (20 July), quoted in "What is British Citizenship," *AC*, 2 November 1912.

its own colonies on a similar matter.[118] From this viewpoint, freedom of migration was a cherished imperial tradition.

However, by the 1910s, some Indian nationalists felt that to accept immigration restriction that avoided explicitly racial language was the most practical solution. They argued that while unrestricted immigration was not a defensible principle, the British empire could not lay down explicitly racial barriers to immigration.[119] Those who took this position emphasized that Indians would not immigrate in any great numbers.[120] Sudhindra Bose, professor of political science at the University of Iowa, called for a "gentleman's agreement" to restrict Indian immigration along the lines of the Japan-US agreement. Even while proposing this agreement, however, Bose reminded the United States Congress, "We are a great class of British subjects…and are entitled to the rights of such a class."[121] In 1907, Gandhi agreed with Smuts that Indian immigration to the Transvaal could be limited to six educated immigrants per year. In 1913, Gandhi and moderate Indian National Congress leader Gopal Krishna Gokhale extended a similar

[118] N. C. Kelkar, quoted in *the Mahratta,* quoted in "A Remarkable Speech on the Transvaal Situation," *IO*, 20 November 1909. The use of the Don Pacifico case also had anti-Semitic overtones, as Kelkar implied that a Gibraltarian Portuguese Jew was barely a British subject, while Indians, as members of the jewel in the crown, were far more valuable imperial assets. After describing Don Pacifico as an "unreasonably avaricious man…a miserable and poor fellow," Kelkar concluded, "Is it not clear that [the Imperial Government] estimate a…Portuguese Jew at far greater worth than their loyal subject in the Indian Empire?" See also: George Lefroy, Bishop of Lehore, quoted in "An Empire Problem: The Bishop of Lahore on the Transvaal Question," *IO*, 6 February 1909.

[119] British Indians Loyalty," *AC*, 19 November 1910; Gokhale, quoted in "Is the Empire A Mockery," *AC*, 9 November 1912; Mazhaul Hague, quoted in "The Indian National Congress; Presidential Address," *AC,* 15 February 1913.

[120] Ampthill to Curzon, 12 August 1909, BL MSS EUR F112/79; Gandhi and Habib letter to the Press , quoted in "The Transvaal Delegates in England," *AC*, 11 December1909; Sunder Singh, reported in "The Sikh in Canada," from *Toronto World*, in *Aryan*, December 1911.

[121] Sudhindra Bose, quoted in "India and the Empire," *AC*, 18 July 1914. See also: Sudhindra Bose and Bishen Singh, "Correspondence: The Asiatic Exclusion Bill in U.S.A.," *Modern Review*, May 1914. Bhose was also founder of the World's Hindusthan Student Federation and the Hindusthan Association of America, and the editor of a magazine entitled *The Hindusthan Student.*

compromise to the Union of South Africa's immigration policy.[122] Gandhi's right-hand man Henry Polak wrote that

> "The principles so laid down would not in the slightest degree affect the ideal of a white South Arica, but a white *British* South Africa cannot, in the interests of the empire as a whole, be permitted to put an insult upon a whole nation."[123]

Polak, like Gandhi and Gokhale, simultaneously reassured South African colonists that they would not be swamped by Indian immigrants and, at the same time, emphasized that the most important issue was the protection of British imperial traditions of *theoretical* racial equality. Polak conceded the right of colonial governments to assert the racist policy of a "white South Africa" while making the racialized and politicized observation that a "white *British* South Africa" could not impose wholesale racial distinctions.[124] By 1914, many of those who had previously called for complete freedom of migration were beginning to accept some restrictions.

These compromises were designed to protect Indian national honor by evading a blanket ban on Indian immigration. This arrangement sacrificed the immigration rights of poorer or less-educated immigrants in favor of upper-class migrants. Ableism and classism influenced the concessions that Indian political leaders were willing to make. Bose particularly objected to classification of prohibited immigrants as "'All Hindu laborers, idiots, imbeciles, paupers, etc.'"[125] Caveats that immigration could be restricted

---

[122] *Statement of the Indian Position for submission to the Right Honourable Lord Curzon*, 27 January 1907, signed by Cachalia, and Gandhi (TBIA), BL MSS EUR F112/79). For similar compromises proposed by the Hindu Friends Society of Victoria, see petition from Hindu Friend Society in Victoria (Robert W. Clark, Arthur Hinder, and L. W. Hall) to SSI, n.d 1911, BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/1064, File 568)

[123] H. S. L. Polak, "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal" in *The State* (June 1909, 686, GLDC HIST 1893/1914, emphasis in the original.

[124] This distinction was in line with the belief that racism was a Afrikaner rather than a British trait, see chapter three.

[125] Bose, quoted in "India and the Empire," *AC* 18 July 1914.

on educational, cultural, or economic grounds became increasingly common.[126] By 1913, even Bhownaggree, previously a staunch defender of unrestricted migration, wrote that while he believed that Indians "should not, qua Indians, be refused admission….I am perfectly ready to admit the right of a Colony or a Dominion to impose restrictions…on economic grounds."[127] By allowing an economic or educational ban, these activists argued that they were avoiding a flat racial ban on all Indian immigration and thus preserving Indian national self-respect.

Others, particularly colonial-born Indians in South Africa as well as the majority of Indian politicians in the subcontinent, protested these concessions vehemently.[128] The *Madras Standard* was not alone in castigating Gokhale for having "abandoned the fundamental principles involved in the controversy, namely the right of the Indians, as citizens of the British Empire to settle in, or emigrate to, any part of the Overseas Dominions.'"[129] Although most Indians believed that unlimited free migration was an inherent right of imperial citizenship, many had by the 1920s come to concede on practical grounds that colonies had the right to impose bars to Indian immigration that were not explicitly racial. This shift was part of a larger strategy on the part of Indian politicians of becoming more conservative in the hope of receiving more self-

[126] TBIA petition to Governor of the Transvaal, 8 June 1903, BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/628, File 402; mass meeting resolutions, 5/12/09, enclosed in A. M. Cachalia (TBIA) to Governor, 6 December 1909, TAB GOV LEER Volume 1194, 15/1/96/1909; Sunder Singh, quoted in "Dr. Sundar Singh Pleads His Cause: Do Not Discriminate Against My People," from the *Montreal Herald*, reproduced in *The Sansar*, June 1914.
[127] Bhownaggree, quoted in *Daily Telegraph*, quoted in "The Rights of Entry: Statement by Sir M. Bhownaggree," *India*, 12 December 1913.
[128] Nationalists in the subcontinent, who with less skin in the game could afford to take the high road, tended to advocate holding out for completely free migration. The colonial-born population also opposed such compromises, worrying that any restrictions would simply encourage more aggression by white settlers. "Mr. Gandhi's letter," *Natal Mercury*, quoted in *AC*, 10 January 1914; "Mr. Gokhale's Return to India," *AC*, 21 December 1912; "India's Verdict," *AC*, 8 February 1913; South African Indian Congress [henceforth SAIC] Union Resolutions, enclosed in SAIC to Secretary for the Interior, Pretoria, 25 August 1919, SAB BNS Volume 1/1/365, 155/74.
[129] *Madras Standard*, quoted in "Indian Press Opinion: Platitudes & Generalities: Dissatisfied with Mr. Gokhale," *AC*, 8 February 1913.

government. As Indian nationalists shifted their emphasis from imperial protection by Britain to self-government for India, they began also to concede more power to the white self-governing colonies.

Self-government, but for whom? Colonial failures and Indian nationalism

Indian nationalists frequently argued that South Africa, Canada, and other Dominions proved themselves unable to handle the responsibility of being self-governing within a large empire.[130] In doing so, those engaged in these debates challenged and inverted many of the discourses of democracy, progress, civilization, and national development that were used to disenfranchise Indians, using those arguments against white settlers instead.

White settlers' ignorance of and indifference towards the history and traditions of the empire was taken as evidence of their unsuitability for responsible government.[131] Self-government within the empire required a willingness to "think Imperially," which colonists, by vexing India and ignoring British imperial traditions of putative racial equality, showed themselves unable or unwilling to do.[132] Racial discrimination was deemed to be evidence of undisciplined, uncouth, and irresponsible settlers' incapacity for self-government.[133] Gurdit Singh, the leader of the *Komagata Maru* immigrants,

---

[130] "The King's Speech," *AC,* 11 December1909; Ampthill, reported in Reuter (London, 9 September) quoted in "Lack of Imperial Duty," *IO*, 26 September 1908.

[131] Madanjit at Indian National Congress [henceforth INC], quoted in *Madras Times*, quoted in "Indians in South Africa," *IO*, 18 February 1905, 102; *Union Citizen* (December), quoted in "The 'Union Citizen' and British Indians," *IO*, 24 December 1910; "H. H. Stevens, M.P., on Hindu Question," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.

[132] "The Situation in Natal," *India*, 21 November 1913. See also: Lord Hardinge, quoted in "The Viceroy's Speech," *IO*, quoted in *AC,* 14 November 1914; J. X. Merriman, quoted in *Times*, quoted in "A Glimpse of Statesmanship," *India*, 21 November 1913; *Bradford Observer*, quoted in "The Unity of the Empire," *IO,* 27 July 1907; Mrs. L. R. Broad, *Victoria Times* (1914), quoted in "Canada: Reconsider the Whole Question," *Canada and India*, July 1915.

[133] "The Eternal Colour," *AC,* 12 August 1911; "General Botha on the Asiatic Question," *AC,* 6 August 1910; "A Gratuitous Insult," *AC,* 29 April 1911; Walter W. Baer, "The Truth about the Hindu," quoted in *Canadian Courier (Toronto Illustrated Weekly)*, quoted in "Indians in Canada," *IO,* 30 March 1912; "Plea

criticized immigration official Malcolm Reid for "'not acting according to law, neither you have the sense which ought to be for a man of your position; nor have sufficient experience of the world.'"[134] What Gurdit Singh criticized in one individual, others attacked as an institutional or even national problem. Polak wrote that forcing Gandhi to walk handcuffed through the streets of Volksrust to the Pretoria gaol "may commend itself to the perverted tastes of the ignorant mummies at Pretoria, but no self-respecting Britisher would approve of, much less would be a party to, such vindictive process of law."[135] Polak identified Pretoria police officers as so "un-British" in their ignorance and tyranny that they merited comparison with long-dead, desiccated Egyptian pharaohs. This proved that "the Boers are not to be trusted with the government of the country, and it is apparent that they are utterly unfit for self-government."[136] Not only Afrikaners were undeserving of self-government, however. *India* described Natal as "the least civilised section of the British Dominions… far less fit for such governing than Jamaica or Ceylon."[137] These arguments resonated with the idea that colonists were racially inferior to the British and thus un-fit for self-government.

Arguments against colonial self-government often framed self-rule in gendered terms. Since franchise and citizenship were associated with manhood, arguments that the Afrikaners or other white settlers were unmanly helped bolster the image that they were unfit for self-government. According to one passenger on the *Komagata Maru*, "The

---

for Transferring Jurisdiction on Immigration Matters to Duly Constituted Courts of Justice," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.

[134] letter from Gurdit Singh (6 July), quoted in letter, RUSH, Reid to Scott, 9 July 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, part 3. See also: "Mr. Smuts' Facts," *IO,* 18 January 1908; "Official Incompetence," *IO*, 4 December 1909 "A Model Citizen: A Review," *IO*, 1 February 1908.

[135] The Biblical references to pharaohical oppression was surely not lost on Jewish Polak or his British Christian audience.

[136] "An Outrageous Act," *AC*, 27 March 1909.

[137] "Civis Britannicus—New Style: "From the 'Nation,'" *India*, 28 November 1913.

Canadians…are quite unjust and inhuman…their thoughts are not like of a man [sic], and they do not care even of [sic] government laws."[138] Unlawful, unmanly, and inhuman, white Canadians, rather than Indians, were the ones unready for self-government. Class, too, played a role, with *Indian Opinion* describing the Transvaal's anti-Indian legislation as "that vulgar effrontery that characterizes the uneducated and the *nouveau riche*, whether individual or national."[139] This article smeared Afrikaners as uncivilized upstarts in the British empire. Colonial-born passive resister Joseph Royeppen agreed that "the Boers have power who are an ungentlemanly lot."[140] Conflating class and race, Royeppen depicted anti-Indian legislation as the result of Afrikaners' un-British, low-class origins. On another occasion, *Indian Opinion* responded to an anti-Asiatic letter by declaring that "The point of the innuendo and the soul of its writer are revealed by the *nom de plume*—Storekeeper."[141] Casting a class aspersion (one commonly used against Indians themselves, but also against South Africa's Jewish population), *Indian Opinion* insinuated that this author was neither a proper citizen nor a proper man—cowardly, small-minded, selfish, and possibly not even British. An anonymous "well-wisher" told H. H. Stevens, the Conservative MP for British Columbia, that "It is not becoming of a gentleman like you to speak ill of and to so deadly against a [sic] faithful and loyal

[138] K. H. S. Sandho [Komgata Maru passenger], "'Nonsense Talks about the Komagata Maru': Hindu Passenger Writes to the Province—His Views in His Own Words," *Province*, 2 July 1914, LAC SP MG27 III B9, Volume 171, Folder Hindu Immigration Incident, July -October 1914, 1915. See also: Justice [psued.] (Sydenham, 23 May 1911), "Is this Justice?" *AC*, 3 June 1911; Resurgam [pseud.], "Correspondence: Re Duke of Connaught's Visit and the Indians," *AC,* 10 December 1910; Bird to Editor of the *Sun*, 28 April 1914, LAC SP MG27 III B9, Volume 169, Folder Bird, J.E., 1914.
[139] "A Striking Contrast," *IO*, 17 July 1909.
[140] Royeppen, "Correspondence," *AC*, 26 December 1908.
[141] "Sir Arthur Lawley and the British Indians," *IO*, 13 May 1905. See also "If the Transvaal consents to be led by the extremists of Potchefstroom and Pietersburg, it stamps itself as a country with the soul of a small shopkeeper and the political honesty of a South American republic" (Anglo-Indian [pseud.], in *Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in "The Asiatic Problem: Plea for a Compromise," *IO*, 6 May 1905. The insult of being a trader by profession was also leveled against the Indian government, which *Indian Daily News* compared to Dickens's character Harris, the green grocer (*Indian Daily News,* quoted in "Will India Retaliate?" *IO*, 12 July 1913).

British Subjects. To Tell [sic] the truth the supremacy of England generally depends on the brave soldiers of India whom you curcastingly [sic] call dusky and unfit British Subjects."[142] Stevens' gentlemanly status was called into question by his racism, while Indian subject-soldiers' masculinity was reaffirmed by recognition of their imperial military service. Neither Britishness nor class status were the perquisite of white settlers; as seen above, Indians claimed that their loyalty made them more valuable to the empire and more properly British than many racist whites. Unmanly, uneducated, un-British, and disloyal, racist white settlers were clearly incapable of exercising self-government.

Arguments about colonists' incapacity for self-government provided a contrast with loyal, imperially-minded Indians who were ready for enfranchisement. Activists pointed to the *panchayat*, the village democracy, and Indians' limited rights of participation in the Raj's legislative councils as evidence that Indians overseas and in the subcontinent were ready for the vote and other rights of citizenship.[143] Contesting arguments that Indians were unfit for self-government, Indian activists invoked European Orientalist scholarship as proof that ancient Indians had representative government. One petition stated,

> "the Indian races have been familiar with representative institutions almost from time immemorial…the Teutonic Mark was hardly so well organised or so *essentially representative* as an Indian village community…Every caste in every village or town…*elects* representatives, and furnishes an exact prototype of the Saxon Witans [sic], from which have sprung the present parliamentary institutions."[144]

---

[142] Wellwisher [sic, pseud.] to Stevens, November 1912, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1.
[143] "Indian Petition to Parliament," *CIN,* 26 July 1901; Gandhi, *The Indian Franchise*, 2, 5; "Hindus Indignant at H. H. Stevens, M.P.; Wish to Retaliate: Mass Meeting Strongly Opposes Deportation of Bhagwam [sic] Singh from Shores of Canada to Native Land: India will Contest question of Subjects," *Sun*, 20 October 1913, VCA SP AM 69, Volume 10, 509-F-2; petition from Natal Indians to SSC, enclosed in Gandhi to Sir Walter Francis Hely Hutchinson, 28 May 1895, NAB CSO Minute Papers 1467/1896, Ref 3105/1896.
[144] Indian Petition to Legislative Council and Assembly of Natal, signed by M. K. Gandhi, Abdulla Hajee Adam, Parsee Rustomjee, and Hajee Mahomed "on behalf of the Indian Community," n.d. [1894], NAB CSO 1417, Minute Papers and Miscellaneous 1894, Ref 3281/1894..

This challenged the connection between whiteness and self-government, implying that Indians' civilizational makeup made them more, rather than less, fitted for self-government than European settlers. This argument intrinsically linked the struggle for self-government in India with the rights of Indians overseas. The INC explicitly connected self-government in the subcontinent and the treatment of Indians overseas, stating, "'What India wants is absolute equality of right with any one of the self-governing Colonies…the treatment given to Indians in Canada was the worst.'"[145] Indian nationalists overseas and in the subcontinent agreed that self-government for India was crucial to securing the position of overseas Indians.[146] *African Chronicle* started an editorial on Indians in South Africa by quoting from the U. S. Declaration of Independence and then stated that Indians needed self-government. For, asked the editorial, "Do they [Indians in Transvaal] not form part and parcel of the British Empire? And if so why are not their interests being protected?"[147] The clear implication was that if the British Empire did not protect Indians in South Africa, they might seek independence outside of the empire. More radical nationalists in Canada and the US compared themselves with other nations, particularly Japan, which as an independent imperial nation, was able to negotiate better treaty terms for immigrants than Indians, who were at the mercy of British indifference.[148]

---

[145] INC resolution, quoted in "India: Want Equality of Citizenship," *Canada and India,* July 1915.
[146] "The British Colonies have no place for Hindusthanees," in *The Free Hindusthan*, quoted in *AC*, 30 January 1909; INC resolutions, quoted in "Mr. Gokhale's Congress Speech," *IO*, 1 March 1913; Taraknath Das, "Hindu Question in United State of America: No. 2," *Hindustanee*, March 1914; Diwan Singh to unnamed Lucknow subadar, quoted in F. C. Isemonger and J. Slattery (Indian Police, Punjab, 1919), *An Account of the Ghadr Conspiracy* (1913-1915) (Lahore: Government Printing, 1919; Sadar, Meerut: Archana Publications, 1998), 24; Lajpat Rai, *Daily News and Leader* (June 10), quoted in "Indians and British Citizenship: A Letter From Mr. Lajpat Rai," *India,* 12 June 1914.
[147] "Truth, Truth, and nothing but the Truth," *AC*, 21 November 1908.
[148] Sudhindra Bose, quoted in "India and the Empire," *AC*, 18 July 1914; *IO*, quoted in "Japan to the Rescue," *AC,* 27 February 1909; "British Indians in Vancouver," *India,* 5 June 1914; "The Larger

A self-governing India could protect overseas Indians from immigration restriction through reciprocal laws barring Europeans from India. Proposals for such reciprocal legislation were designed to show the unfairness of colonial immigration restriction and other anti-Indian laws.[149] *African Chronicle* suggested "a Travellers' Restriction Bill, imposing vexatious conditions, such as enjoining every Colonial white man to wear a turban and to pass an education test, say in Telugu, Orissa and Konkani languages."[150] Such linguistic challenges were common suggestions in Indian papers, responding to colonial legislation that used English or European literacy as a litmus test while refusing to recognize Indian languages. Others suggested that colonists be barred from Government of India positions or even military service in India.[151] These suggestions were not merely retaliation as a practical deterrent; they hearkened back to

---

Patriotism," *India,* 24 July 1914. Comparisons with Japan were common amongst Indian nationalists at this time, as Japan offered an inspiring example of an Asian nation that had achieved equality with or even superiority to European nations (Cemil Aydin, "A Global Anti-Western Moment? The Russo-Japanese War, Decolonization, and Asian Modernity, in *Competing Visions of World Order*: *Global Moments and Movements, 1880s-1930s*, edited by Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Eri Hotta, "Rash Behari Bose and His Japanese Supporters: An Insight into Anti-Colonial Nationalism and Pan Asianism," *Interventions* 8, no. 1 (2006): 116-32; Michael Silvestri, "The Bomb, *Bhadralok*, *Bhagavad Gita*, and Dan Breen: Terrorism in Bengal and its Relation to the European Experience," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 21, no. 1 (2009): 1-27).

[149] "Interview with Mr. Gokhale: Feeling in India: Growing Demands for Retaliation: The Imperial Aspect," *AC,* 21 December 1912; INC resolution, quoted in "Empire's Obligation to India," *AC,* 8 March 1913; "Notes & Comments: The Future Line of Action," *AC,* 3 May 1913; Besant, quoted in "News and Notes," *Aryan,* October 1911. Boycott of colonial or British goods was a popular form of retaliation: (H. Rahim at INC, quoted in "What the Canada Indians think of South African Indians," *AC,* 20 September 1913; *Indu-Prakash*, quoted in "India and the Colonies: Wanted a Committee and a Boycott too," *AC,* 11 October 1913; Nawab Sahib Bahadur, quoted in "Notable Utterances," *AC,* 28 March 1914). Another popular idea was to ban indentured emigration to colonies which discriminated against Indians (INC resolution, quoted in "The Indian National Congress: Indignant Feeling Aroused on the Transvaal Question," *IO*, 12 February 1910). This idea was eventually implemented in regards to Natal, banning indentured labor in response to Indian outrage at the treatment of Indians in the Transvaal. However, this ban came only a few years before India stopped indentured emigration altogether and although observers interpreted it as a retaliatory gesture, its efficacy in getting the Transvaal legislation rescinded was not noticeable. It had more effect in calming Indian agitation than anything else ("Stoppage of Indian Immigration," *AC,* 7 January 1911).

[150] "National Congress Special Session," *AC,* 17 February 1912. See also: *India's Appeal*, 13.

[151] S. R. Krishnama Chariar, quoted in "An Indian Patriot and his Emperor: The British Indians in the British Colonies," *IO*, 7 January 1904; Ahmed Moola Dawood to the Rangoon Public Services Commission, quoted in "News in Brief," *IO*, 3 May 1913.

rhetoric that colonists were inferior to the British either through birth or breeding and that colonists therefore made bad imperialists in India.[152] Upon hearing that a New Zealander was appointed professor at Muir College Allahabad, *Indian Opinion* opined that "it is questionable whether Colonies command the same respect [as an Englishman], especially when drawn from places like South Africa, where the off scourings [sic] of Europe have persuaded themselves into a belief that the Indian belongs to an inferior species of the *genus homo.*'"[153] Here again, racism was seen as a stereotypically colonial, rather than British, trait. Racially suspect *because of* their racism, these colonists would not be accepted as real imperialists by Indian subjects. Retaliation was therefore a means of protecting Indians from the ineradicable racism of white colonists.

From 1914 onwards, as Indians increasingly ceded the right of the self-governing colonies to enact immigration restriction, the principle of reciprocity became the thin reed on which they came to rely. Whereas before the war, Indians had argued that imperial citizenship trumped self-government's right of immigration restriction, events in 1914 marked a shift in imperial and Indian politics. In South Africa, the Gandhi-Smuts agreement ended the passive resistance movement. In Canada, the deportation of would-be Indian immigrants on the *Komagata Maru* and the violent encounter between those passengers and the police upon their return to India marked the end of Indian immigration to Canada. After this point, Indians increasingly conceded the right of colonies to restrict immigration. This concession marked a broader turn from imperial to national politics.

Whereas before 1914, Indians had turned to the imperial government for protection and emphasized imperial unity under British control, after 1914 they

[152] See chapter three.
[153] "'No Colonials Need Apply,'" *IO*, 13 September 1913.

increasingly demanded Indian self-government within the empire and reframed imperial unity as a negotiated stalemate between equal colonial and Indian members. At the Imperial Conferences in 1917, Sir S. P. Sinha, the Indian member, proposed a resolution stating that the Commonwealth countries and India were entitled to complete control of immigration restriction.[154] This idea of reciprocity envisioned an imperial federation in which the Dominions and India occupied equal positions.[155] In essence, during the post-1914 period, defenders of Indians overseas gradually came to accept the vision of a federated empire of equal states that they had denigrated earlier as "a very travesty of Imperialism."[156] What INC leaders had derided in 1910 as a "mere agglomeration of states" had become by the 1920s the political reality in which Indian nationalists operated. Their concern shifted from trying to force the imperial government to exert control over the colonies, to making sure that India was included in those self-governing states. In 1923, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru reassured the Dominion representatives at the Imperial Conference,

> "my resolution absolutely safeguards…the independence of the Dominions…it is not merely because I am anxious that the Dominions should have that independence that I have provided that safeguard, but because of a lurking feeling of self-interest in my mind. You have received a rich inheritance of independence, freedom, and self-government in your territories. I am still aspiring to it. I hope my aspirations will be

[154] Yarwood, "Overseas Indians," 214. For full text of the reciprocity resolution of 1918, see C. F. Andrews, ed., *Documents Relating to the New Asiatic bill and the Alleged Breach of Faith* ([Cape Town: Cape Times Ltd., 1926]), 20.
[155] Jogesh Misrow, "East Indian Immigration on the Pacific Coast," (Stanford, CA: May 1915).39..
[156] "Johannesburg Jottings: By Our Transvaal Representative: Canada and Indians," *IO*, 29 September 1906. See also: Polak, quoted in *Review of Reviews,* quoted in "Transvaal Indians' Predicament: British Press Comments: On Race Prejudice," *IO*, 12 October 1907; "Hindus Hold Mass Meeting to Air Grievances: Pass Resolutions which will be forwarded to the Secretary of State for India. Desire Many Changes," *The Daily News Advertiser,* 17 April 1911, enclosed in Hopkinson to Cory, 18 April 1911, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 4; *The Nation*, quoted in "Comments and Criticisms: The 'Nation' on Citizenship," *IE*, August 1914.

> realized very soon and like you I shall be jealous if any outside authority imposes its will upon me in settling this question."[157]

During the interwar era, Indians increasingly turned away from pre-war notions of "*civis Britannicus sum*" towards a version of the empire as quasi-independent self-governing federated units.

While Indians imagined a robust self-governing state with the power of retaliation, the imperial government adopted a de-fanged version of the principle in the interwar years, refusing real self-government to India while allowing immigration restriction in the colonies on the grounds that India could theoretically restrict European colonials.[158] Imperial Conference resolutions concealed the reality of racism in the empire by offering the fig leaf statement that "the exclusion in either case was not motivated by prejudice of race, but was the outcome of different economic conditions…It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control…by means of restriction on immigration."[159] By the 1920s, resolutions on reciprocity had the effect of disguising the material force of white supremacy within the empire by imagining India and the white settler colonies as "separate but equal" entities within the empire. This aspirational politics of self-government provided a way of reconciling Indian nationalism and imperialism, but would wear increasingly thin over the twentieth century as it slowly became apparent that Britain never intended to grant India true self-government.

Conclusion

---

[157] *Hindu Question: Proposal of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, Imperial Conference,* 24 October 1923, LAC W.illiam Lyon Mackenzie King Papers, MG26 J4. See also: "Comments: Birth of New Spirit," *IV,* 12 March 1915.

[158] Pachai, *International Aspects*, 80. In addition, none of the imperial councils' resolutions were binding (Karatani, *Defining*, 74).

[159] *Report of the Committee of the Privy Council* 26 March 1919, LAC BP OC 196 (2)-OC 196 (6), MG26, H 1(a), Volume 40,.

Anti-Indian legislation at the turn of the century was believed to threaten the survival of the British empire itself. Whether through philosophical or physical disintegration, contemporaries believed that the empire was doomed if it did not successfully address the conflict. The meaning of imperial citizenship and self-government were integral to this solution. And yet while everyone agreed that these were the two terms under discussion, no one agreed on what they meant. The indeterminate, undefined nature of imperial citizenship made it the perfect platform for far-flung, politically disparate actors to mobilize transnationally without creating deep political ties. Chapter three maps some of the contradictions of this discourse in the context of local racial geographies.

Chapter Three

The Indian Settler: Navigating Racial Hierarchies in Natal and British Columbia

Ostensibly race-blind, imperial citizenship as articulated by Indian opponents of immigration restriction was, as the last two chapters have indicated, consistently infused with racialized implications. Those fighting against the color bar were quite adept at utilizing the ubiquitous racism of the day to their advantage. Whether implying that anti-Indian immigration laws were the province of racially impure, un-British settlers or that Indians deserved representative government due to their ancient civilizational capacity for democracy (see chapter two), the fight against white settler racism was deeply imbedded in the logics of racial hierarchy. However, the tone and import of this racialized language manifested itself differently in different parts of the empire. As Georgie Wemyss has argued, transnational discourses like whiteness—or imperial citizenship—were located in specific contexts and historians must be able to recognize that a transnational "common sense" language was constantly interrupted and nuanced by local particularity and difference.[1]

This chapter argues, first, that imperial citizenship was a highly racialized discourse, even in the mouths of those, like diasporic Indians, who objected to those racial definitions of imperial citizenship that excluded them. Specifically, imperial citizenship functioned critically as a whitening device for Indian activists challenging European settlers' attempts to impose a stark division between black and white. Secondly, this chapter explores the important differences between racial discourses in Canada and South Africa. Indian activists in Canada explicitly linked imperial citizenship

[1] Georgie Wemyss, *The Invisible Empire: White Discourse, Tolerance, and Belonging* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 15.

to whiteness by invoking theories of Punjabi Sikhs' Aryan origins. In South Africa, activists compared Indians with black Africans and argued that Indians were Britons, in contrast to Afrikaner and European settlers. Thus, while Canadian Indian specifically evoked whiteness in terms of both skin color and Aryan origins, for South African Indians the emphasis was less about a generic whiteness and more about discourses of anti-blackness and Britishness.

This chapter brings together two important fields of scholarship: whiteness studies and studies of settler colonialism. Scholars in both the North American and Indian Ocean contexts explore the role that Indian migrants played as settlers and sub-imperial agents.[2] Meanwhile, British empire historians have only recently begun applying whiteness studies beyond the US context.[3] My work brings these fields into conversation with each other, examining how Indian immigrants used logics of settler colonialism and imperial citizenship to navigate intersecting and shifting racial hierarchies across the empire. I argue that Indian activists' claims to imperial citizenship were consistently entangled in explicit and implicit assertions of their whiteness. At the same time, however, whiteness had very different valences in the North American and Indian Ocean contexts. A comparative approach shows how Indians in both Canada and South Africa asserted an

[2] Thomas R. Metcalf, *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena 1860-1920* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); Neilesh Bose, "New Settler Colonial Histories at the Edges of Empire: 'Asiatics,' settlers, and law in colonial South Africa," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 15, no. 1 (2014), https://muse.jhu.edu/; Savita Nair, "Shops and Stations: Rethinking Power and Privilege in British/Indian East Africa," in *India in Africa, Africa in India: Indian Ocean Cosmopolitanisms*, ed. John C. Hawley (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008); Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya*; Dean Itsuji Saranillo, "Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3-4 (2013): 280-294.

[3] Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus, "Re-Orienting Whiteness: A New Agenda for the Field," in *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, eds. Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Mizutani, *Meaning of White*; Harald Fischer-Tine, *Low and Licentious Europeans: Race, Class, and 'white Subalternity' in Colonial India* (Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan Pvt Ltd, 2009); Mohanram, *Imperial White*.

aspirational whiteness, even as the context and meaning of that whiteness differed critically between the two colonies.

In *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus argue that historians must be more careful in distinguishing between whiteness as an analytical category applied retrospectively by scholars and an empirical category used by historical subjects.[4] In this chapter, I use whiteness as an analytical category that encompasses a wide range of racialized language within the primary sources. However, there are moments where the language of whiteness, and its close cousin Aryanism, was explicitly used by historical actors. Throughout the chapter I try to carefully highlight the moments and places in which historical subjects used "white" and when other discourses—anti-blackness, settler colonialism, Britishness—were used instead. Nonetheless, this chapter argues that whiteness is a useful analytical rubric through which to interpret racialized discourses even when the word "white" itself does not appear in the historical record. By using whiteness as an analytical category, I am able to more accurately dissect the transnational and localized resonances of the imperial citizenship as a racialized discourse.

The meanings of a transnationally-shared discourse like imperial citizenship were transformed by local contexts. Although imperial citizenship was a whitening device, it operated differently in South Africa and Canada, as Indian activists responded to the racial and political context in which they found themselves. Indians in British Columbia found themselves in a colony in which the white population was overwhelmingly of British origin, surrounded by Asian and First Nations minorities. The Canadian Indian population at its height was only several thousands, outnumbered by far by Chinese and

[4] Boucher et al, "Re-Orienting Whiteness," 7.

Japanese workers.[5] As such, white settlers frequently subsumed Indian immigrants within concerns about a larger Asian threat. Activists responded to this, portraying themselves as white settlers just like the British, differentiating themselves strongly from the Chinese and Japanese populations, and largely ignoring the First Nations' presence.[6] In South Africa, in contrast, the Indian population was much larger than other Asian groups. As a result, South African Indians found themselves the primary target of anti-Asiatic measures, although they allied with Chinese immigrants on occasion. The South African white population was divided between the Afrikaner and British communities, particularly in the Transvaal, which held the second largest Indian population after Natal. In a world in which "racialism" most often referred to tensions between Afrikaners and British, rather than between white and black populations, "white" was an insufficiently specific racial identity and so South African Indians emphasized their Britishness. At the same time, they emphatically asserted their difference from Africans. The local context in which Indians situated themselves greatly influenced the racial overtones they applied to the transnationally-shared discourse of imperial citizenship.

The internal demographics of Indian immigration also influenced political organization and racial rhetoric. Indians in Canada, as discussed in earlier chapters, were almost entirely Sikh Punjabis, many of them ex-British Army soldiers. Because the majority of Canadian Indian immigrants were from North India, they were better

[5] Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 96; Johnston, *East Indians*, 6; Dua, "Racialising Imperial Canada," 121.

[6] Renisa Mawani's recent work explores the contradictory ways in which both white settlers and Indians utilized the imaginary figure of the indigenous person to police Indian immigration while ignoring the very real material dispossession of the native population in British Columbia in this period (Renisa Mawani, "Spectres of Indigeneity in South Asian Migration, 1914," (lecture, Rama Watumull Collaborative Lecture Series, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, March 2011), 8-10. A revised version of this talk has since been published as Renisa Mawani, "Specters of Indigeneity in British Indian Migration," *Law and Society Review* 46, no. 2 (June 2012): 369-403).

positioned to use the language of Aryanism and to emphasize their light skin color than the more heterogeneous population of South African Indians, many of whom were from the southern province of Madras. In contrast, by the turn of the twentieth century, the South African Indian population was largely divided between the Tamil-speaking Hindu or Christian indentured and ex-indentured workers and a smaller group of Gujarati-speaking Muslim merchants and professionals. These divisions heavily influenced the available racial rhetoric. South African Indians, as a unified population, could not as readily claim Aryan heritage.[7] This discussion is *not* intended to reinforce antiquated invented traditions of racial essentialism within South Asia, but to point out how demographic differences shaped the rhetoric that was available to Indians in South Africa and Canada at the turn of the twentieth century. In a world of racial hierarchies, Indian activists maneuvered the existing rhetoric in order to gain as much privilege and recognition as they could.

In analyzing the transnational circulation of the discourse of imperial citizenship, historians must attune their ears to attend to shared grammars of citizenship and race while also being sensitive to the accents and inflections of localized meaning.

Whiteness and Imperial Citizenship: Transnational Discourses

"Whiteness studies" as a field in critical race theory emerged out of US labor history in the 1990s. However, black Americans have been writing about whiteness as a shifting, contingent, and constructed identity since the late nineteenth century.[8] In the

[7] For an analysis of Tamil nationalists' uses of Aryan theory, see Dagmar Hellman-Rajanayagam, "Is there a Tamil 'race'?" in *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, ed. Peter Robb (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[8] David Roediger, "Introduction," in *Black on White: Black Writers on what it means to be White*, ed. David R. Roediger (New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1998), 19. My deepest gratitude to Zach Sell for pointing this out to me, and specifically for directing me to James Baldwin's writing on the subject.

1980s, James Baldwin argued that "No one was white before he/she came to America. It took generations, and a vast amount of coercion, before this became a white country." Rather, European immigrants "paid the price of the ticket" by *becoming* white, through participation in the twin genocidal projects of US settler colonialism and slavery/lynch law.[9] Building on these insights, scholars such as David Roediger, Matthew Frye Jacobson, and Noel Ignatiev have tracked how Jewish, Irish, Southern and Eastern European immigrants were originally excluded from the privileges of whiteness and howt the monolithic racial terrain of a white/black binary emerged over the course of the twentieth century.[10] This historiography, however, has been overwhelmingly focused on the US context.

Only recently have historians of the British empire (and elsewhere in the world) begun to expand the temporal and geographic range of whiteness studies. *ReOrienting Whiteness*, for example, calls for whiteness studies to better recognize its indebtedness to postcolonial theory while also decentering the US by expanding whiteness studies to the British empire's settler colonies.[11] In contrast, scholars such as Harald Fischer-Tine and Satoshi Mizutani, amongst others, explore the shifting definitions of whiteness across race, gender, and class lines in British India.[12] Radhika Mohanram's *Imperial White* moves between Britain, India, Australia, and New Zealand to analyze the negotiated construction of British and British settler whiteness, defined against Indian, Maori, and

[9] James Baldwin, *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction 1948-1985* (New York: St. Martin's/Marek, 1985), 178.
[10] Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*; Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Colour*; Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*.
[11] Boucher et al, "Re-Orienting Whiteness," 2. See also: Jones, *Engendering;* Jonathan Hyslop, "The Imperial Working Class Makes Itself 'White': White Labourism in Britain, Australia and South Africa Before the First World War," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 12, no. 4 (December 1999): 398-421.
[12] Mizutani, *The Meaning of White*; Fischer-Tine, *Low and Licentious*..

other colonial subjects' Otherness.[13] These scholars examine the precarious whiteness of early colonial settlers in the US, Australia, and the Caribbean, as well as of the domiciled and Eurasian communities in India. By showing the shifting boundaries of whiteness across time and place, scholars have revealed whiteness to be a historical construct rather than an eternally reified category.

However, whiteness studies has remained focused on Europeans.[14] Historians have rarely applied whiteness studies to those, like Indians in the settler colonies, who claimed the privileges of whiteness at the turn of the century but who are not now included in the rubric of whiteness.[15] Yet diasporic Indians used very similar rhetorical strategies to "prove" their whiteness as they competed with such marginally white groups as Jews, Southern and Eastern European immigrants, and Afrikaners. Looking at the racial rhetoric of those who aspired to a white identity allows us to truly see the contingency of whiteness in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Mohranham argues that the Indian man's "visible difference would prevent him from ever being conferred with a liberal subjectivity,"[16] but Indians (particularly northern Indians, high-caste Indians, and Parsis) at the time were eager to point out that their complexions were

[13] Mohanram, *Imperial White*.
[14] Important exceptions that look at South Asians and whiteness in the US context include Koshy, "Complex Interstices of Whiteness"; John Tehranian, "Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Contstruction of Racial Identity in America," *The Yale Law Journal* Vol. 109, No. 4 (January 2000): 817-848.
[15] At least, South Asians are generally not considered white in current European and North American political landscapes. Whiteness plays out very differently in other parts of the world. In South Asia in particular, whiteness has been mapped onto North/South divides, discourses of Aryan invasions, and caste hierarchies. The continued popularity of skin-lightening beauty products and of marriage ads requesting pale wives demonstrate that colorism is alive and well in South Asia (Shefali Chandra, "Whiteness on the Margins of Native Patriarchy: Race, Caste, Sexuality, and the Agenda of Transnational Studies," *Feminist Studies* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 127-153; Amali Philips, "Gendering Colour: Identity, Femininity, and Marriage in Kerala," *Anthropologica* 46, no. 2 (2004): 253-72; Radhika Parameswaran and Kavitha Cardoza, *Melanin on the margins: advertising and the cultural politics of fair/light/white beauty in India* (Columbia, South Carolina: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 2009)).
[16] Mohanram, *Imperial White*, 12.

no darker than that of Italians, Greeks, or even colonial settlers and that their features were "European" or "Aryan."[17] Indians at the time did not see themselves as "British m[e]n who could never be realized;" they saw themselves as British men, as white men, and as imperial citizens, all the while recognizing that these identities were precarious and contingent.[18] Taking their claims to whiteness seriously restores flexibility and desperation to the racial politics of the time. In the scramble to draw a global color line, Indian immigrants were just one among many marginalized groups attempting to claim the elusive privileges of whiteness.

Recent work on Indians in Africa and the Indian Ocean littoral demonstrates that diasporic nationalism and anti-colonialism were universalizing forces that were often complicit in settler colonialism and anti-blackness.[19] Meanwhile, scholars and activists in the US and Canada have argued for the importance of analyzing Asian American communities' role in settler colonialism.[20] Rhetoric of Indian productivity (in contrast to

[17] Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration", 50-3; "A Hindu Can Become an American Citizen: Brahmans are the best Representatives of the Indo-German Stock," *Indian Emigrant*, August 1914; Ram Chandra, "Exclusion of Hindus from America Due to British Influence," (San Francisco: Hindustan Gadar, 1916), 4; Queen Victoria quoted in *Parsi Chronicle*, "Queen Victoria and the Indian People," *IO*, 6 July 1907; Kanta Das Rajani, *Hindustani Workers on the Pacific Coast* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter & Co, 1922). 115-6. For an analysis of the controversy generated by Lord Salisbury's description of Naoroji as a "blackman" in 1888, see Burton, "Tongues Untied," esp. 636-7. For a criticism of this strategy as futile and ill-natured, see: "A Word to the Parsees," *IO*, 20 October 1906.

[18] Mohanram, *Imperial White*, 12.

[19] Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya*; Brennan, *TAIFA*, esp. introduction and chapter two; Hofmeyr and Williams, "South Africa–India"; Bose, "New Settler Colonial Histories"; Hofmeyr et al., "Introduction," esp. 4, 13-15; Nair, "Shops and Stations"; Mark Ravinder Frost, "In Search of Cosmopolitan Discourse: A Historical Journey across the Indian Ocean from Singapore to South Africa, 1870-1920," in *Eyes Across the Water: Navigating the Indian Ocean*, eds. Pamila Gupta, Isabel Hofmeyr, and Michael Pearson (Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2010), 88-9; Metcalf, *Imperial Connections*. Much of the scholarship on Indian settler colonialism focuses on East Africa, since it was in East Africa that the vision of India and Indians as subimperial agents was articulated most explicitly. See the introduction for an explanation of why I choose to focus on South Africa.

[20] In the North American context, the debate around Asian settler colonialism amongst academics and anti-racist activists tends to focus on more contemporary politics. Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua, "Decolonizing Antiracism," *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005): 120-43. For a counter-argument, see: Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States," *Social Justice* 35,

African or Native American laziness) and depictions of Africa or Canada as "empty" lands awaiting colonization echoed European settler discourses, while simultaneously challenging the assumption that these colonies were meant to be "white men's country."[21] Sana Aiyar observes that for East African Indian merchants "antisettler views did not…lead these men to question the imperial project itself."[22] These contradictions were embedded in the notion of imperial citizenship itself, a supposedly universalizing status that was nonetheless implicitly exclusionary and limited. In using the discourse of imperial citizenship, Indian activists articulated a "challenge [to] the racism of empire [that] was based on extending a racialised privilege."[23] The insights of whiteness studies, in interaction with an analysis of the highly localized racial contexts of settler colonialism, is necessary to understanding the complexities and contradictions of the racialized meanings of imperial citizenship.

The claim to be imperial citizens was fundamentally imbricated in Indian activists' aspiration to the politics of whiteness. Like imperial citizenship, whiteness, too, served as a floating signifier whose very amorphousness marked its political utility. Before the mid-twentieth century, whiteness did not merely mean skin color but was marked by a larger set of behaviors and values. Whiteness was dependent upon a person's dress, education, language, food, housing, and a myriad of other factors. Although skin color mattered, it did not serve as the single determinant. Whiteness, or race in general, was also mutable over the course of one person's lifetime. Until at least

---

no. 3 (2008-2009): 120-38. These pieces do not engage specifically with the earlier twentieth century history of Indians in North America. See also: Saranillo, "Why Asian settler colonialism matters."

[21] As early as 1895, Gandhi wrote, "I do not even understand" the claim that Natal "shall be and remain a white man's country and not a black man's" (M. K. Gandhi, *The Indian Franchise: An Appeal To every Briton in South Africa* (Durban T. L. Cullingworth, December 1895), 8).

[22] Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya*, 64.

[23] Dua, "Racialising Imperial Canada," 131.

the second half of the nineteenth century, racial theory held that a person's skin color and race might change depending on climate, interracial intimacies, or adaptation to local cultural practices.[24] The fear that colonists were "going native" gave voice to anxieties about racial degeneration even after scientists posited racial difference as biological and immutable.[25] Mixed-race descent, sexual activity, or poverty could exacerbate the difference between colonists and metropolitan imperialists.[26] If poor urban Britons in London could lose their whiteness—as many social reformers posited during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century—how much more vulnerable were colonists on the margins of empire?[27] Indian activists utilized the flexibility of whiteness in their arguments against anti-Indian legislation. They argued, first, that racial discrimination was un-British and therefore evidence of European colonists' racial degeneration (see also chapter two). Second, elite Indians emphasized their adoption of British social mores and Aryan racial heritage as evidence of their own whiteness.

---

[24] Katy L. Chiles, *Transformable Race: Surprising Metamorphoses in the Literature of Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014)*;* Mark Harrison, *Climates and Constitutions: Health, Race, Environment and British Imperialism in India, 1600-1850* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), 11-12, 19-22; Wilson, *Island Race*, especially chapter two; Jones, *Engendering whiteness*, especially introduction and chapters one and two; Brooke Newman, "Gender, Sexuality, and the Formation of Racial Identities in the 18th Century Anglo-Caribbean World," *Gender & History* 22, no. 3 (November 2010): 1-18.

[25] Anderson, *Cultivation*, esp. 2 and chapter one; Mizutani, *Meaning of White*, 17, 29-30, 38-45; Mohanram, *Imperial White*, chapter three, esp. 132; Harrison, *Climates and Constitutions*, 19-22; Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), esp. p. 4-6, chapters one and seven.

[26] Fischer-Tine, *Low and Licentious*; Mohanram, *Imperial White*, chapters two, three, and four; Mizutani, *Meaning of White;* Ashwini Tambe, "Hierarchies of subalternity: Managed stratification in Bombay's brothels, 1914-1930," in *The Limits of Colonial Control in South Asia: Spaces of Disorder in the Indian Ocean Region*, eds. Ashwini Tambe and Harald Fischer-Tiné (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 121-154.

[27] John Marriott, *The Other Empire: Metropolis, India, and Progress in the Colonial Imagination* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); Ruth Lindeborg, "The 'Asiatic' and the Boundaries of Victorian Englishness," *Victorian Studies* 37 (Spring 1994): 382, 388; Joseph McLaughlin, *Writing the Urban Jungle: reading empire in London from Doyle to Eliot* (University of Virginia Press, 2000), esp. chapters three and four.

Although immigration legislation and other segregationist practices attempted to draw physical boundaries between white and non-white, the definition of whiteness remained unfixed. Anti-immigrant rhetoric frequently objected to immigrants in terms of food, dress, language, religion, and other markers of racial difference that were not based on skin color. These objections were often the same whether directed at Chinese in Australia or Italians in the United States.[28] Whiteness was an amorphous category, articulated through many different indicators of respectability. Thus, it is no surprise to find that immigration legislation, while aimed at racial discrimination, often ended up being drawn along class and gender lines: higher application fees for Asian than for European immigrants, bans on labor migration, literacy tests, language restrictions, and bans on wife and family migration were common barriers faced by Indians in the white settler colonies.[29] All of these disproportionately targeted poor and female immigrants.

Indeed, elite Indian activists often condoned those restrictions that targeted working-class immigrants. Repeatedly throughout his South African tenure, Gandhi accepted, and even promoted, immigration restriction that expressed racial exclusion through class terms, such as the imposition of education and/or means tests in Natal's Immigration Restriction Act of 1897 or the Transvaal's Immigration Restriction Act of

[28] James R. Barrett and David R. Roediger, "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class, *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16, no. 3 (Spring, 1997): 22-23; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 27, 30-35. This is not to deny that Chinese and Indians were barred from the economic and political privileges of whiteness with far more regularity than Eastern or Southern European immigrants were. However, I would argue that Barrett and Roediger's "Inbetween Peoples" were not simply Europeans, but included a range of not-quite-white actors including Asians. Grouping Asians in with blacks as "non-whites" obscures the very real political and economic privileges that some Asian immigrants had over blacks and the extent to which Indians (and Chinese and Japanese) aspired to position themselves as whites.

[29] See chapter two.

1907.[30] Elite activists also objected to restrictions on housing, trading, and travel that were applied regardless of class differences.[31] The NIC and TBIA were often quite willing to defend the rights of merchants or educated professionals by trading away lower-class and indentured Indians' rights. For instance, in 1903, the TBIA sent a petition to the Transvaal government suggesting that added immigration restrictions be imposed on indentured Indians in exchange for burgher rights for Indian traders already in Transvaal.[32] During the passive resistance struggle, Gandhi promised Smuts that Indians would voluntarily register to be fingerprinted if the law requiring fingerprinting was removed. However, wealthy Indians were exempt from fingerprinting. Gandhi defended this position on the grounds that "If even educated persons are required to give finger-impressions for purposes of identification, then they cease to be a means of identification and take on a racial aspect. There are natural distinctions of class which no one can oppose."[33] Similarly, Hajee Habib, speaking for the Transvaal British Indian Association, assured the government that "Indians quite understood that only respectable and well-clad persons should [use the sidewalks or ride in cabs], and that the common coolie-hawker should keep to the middle of the street."[34] Class-based restriction, even when explicitly directed in racialized ways against Indian immigrants in particular, was

[30] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi,* 36-7, 124, 129. The debates around the 1907 Immigration Act also centered on the question of administrative vs. legislative restriction. According to Gandhi and A. M. Cachalia, the TBIA was willing to accept the practical restriction of Indian immigrants to only 6 educated Indians per year, but they insisted that the *practice* of immigration restriction was distinct from the enshrining of a similar restriction in law. See for example: *Statement of the Indian Position for submission to the Right Honourable, Lord Curzon*, signed by Cachalia and Gandhi, 27 January 1907, BL MSS EUR F112/79; petition from Transvaal British Indian Association [henceforth TBIA] to Governor General (Transvaal), 8 June 1903, BL/India Office Records [henceforth IOR]/L/PJ/6/628, File 402; H. S. L. Polak, "The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal" in *The State*, June 1909, GLDC HIST 1893/1914.
[31] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 96.
[32] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 97.
[33] Gandhi, quoted in Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 128.
[34] Confidential from Pretoria Agent, 28 April 1898, in *No. 261, Further Correspondence [October 18, 1897, to December 15, 1898] on the subject of Affairs in the South African Republic. In continuation of African No. 536; continued by African No. 571* (Colonial Office, March 1899), TNA CO 879/51, No. 543.

preferable to what elite Indians referred to as a "racial ban" that applied regardless of social and economic status.

The behavioral markers of whiteness carried class and gender connotations as well as overarching racial meaning. Milner, often seen as one of the architects of white settler identity, nonetheless acknowledged that "when a coloured man possesses a certain high grade of civilisation, he ought to obtain what I may call 'white privileges' irrespective of his colour."[35] Racial distinctions might be overcome through a performance of Britishness that transcended mere skin color. The conflation of class and race is reflected in Indu Prakas Bannerji's assertion that unassisted immigration to Canada would consist of "the better class people of India. By better, I mean, those men that are racially, intellectually, and otherwise, nearer to the Aryan races of Europe."[36] According to Bannerji, those immigrants who could afford to come to Canada would also be socially, culturally, and biologically more similar to Europeans than lower-class Indian immigrants. Likewise, Gandhi's defense of South African Indian rights was premised on his status as a British gentleman, a category that combined class, race, and gender markers.[37] The iconic moment of Gandhi's political awakening—his eviction from a first-class train carriage in Pietermaritzburg—is representative of the imperial citizenship he espoused. Drawing on this experience, Gandhi wrote in 1896 that one of the grievances of South African Indians was that "The most respectable Indian spotlessly dressed cannot as of right travel first or second class on the Transvaal railways. He is

[35] Alfred Milner to Secretary of State for Colonies [henceforth SSC], CONFIDENTIAL, 18 April 1904, National Archives Repository (Public Records of Transvaal Province) [henceforth TAB] GOV LEER Volume 662, 15/04; also quoted in Gandhi's letter to *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in "Mr. Gandhi's Letter: Law 3 of 1885," *Indian Opinion Supplement*, 11 August 1906.
[36] Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration," 50.
[37] Thanks to Teresa Barnes for pushing me on this point. Hunt, *Gandhi in London*; Judith M. Brown, "Gandhi--a Victorian gentleman: An essay in imperial encounter," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 68-85.

huddled together with the natives of all sorts and conditions in a third class compartment."[38] Gandhi, and the elite South African Indians that he represented, believed that imperial citizenship protected them from being classed with *either* black Africans or lower-class Indians. Sikh petitioners emphasized their military service as evidence of their Britishness and masculinity, while lawyers like passive resister Joseph Royeppen stressed his advanced degree from London as proof of his class status and Britishness.[39] An editorial in *Indian Opinion* argued that "Manly—gentlemanly—qualities are not, in our experience, present or absent in proportion as an individual's complexion is fair or dark." The article, which compared South African Indian footballers to "our best type of college lads at Home [Britain]," challenged racial ascriptions based on skin color while still upholding the gendered and classed attributes that implied respectability.[40] Indians' claims to imperial citizenship depended on their ability to demonstrate their race, class, *and* gender qualifications for that political status. The means of demonstrating these qualifications might change, depending on the speaker, but the fundamental components of imperial citizenship and its ultimate connotations of whiteness existed across the empire.

Elite activists responded to segregationist laws by emphasizing those behaviors that might indicate their whiteness. Again, unsurprisingly, those behaviors were often evidence of education or money, as well as a willingness to adopt European norms. A

[38] M. K. Gandhi, "Notes on the Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa," 22 September 1896, GLDC HIST 1906/1914.
[39] "Passive Resistance New Recruits: Pass Unchallenged at the Border," *IO*, December 1909; Observer [pseud.], "Notes on Current Topics: A Contrast," *AC*, 19 March 1910; Ram [pseud.], "Correspondence: A Natal-Born Hero," *AC*, 2 April 1910; Joseph Royeppen, George Godfrey, Jas. W. Godfrey, S. R. Pather, and A. H. Gool to SSC, 3 November 1906, TAB LTG LEER, Volume167, Transvaal Des. No 792. For Sikh military service, see below.
[40] The same article stated that South African Indians were "Industrious, well-mannered and well-behaved, intelligent and educated as Europeans" (L. W. Ritch, "From the Editor's Chair: Should it be?" *IO*, 3 June 1911).

colonial-born South African protested that Indians were denied equal rights even though "The majority of the Colonial-born Indians are educated, they have adopted European ways and civilisation; they have assimilated Western dress, manner, customs, etc., and in some cases Western language (English)."[41] In an attempt to normalize Sikh appearance, a Christian missionary in Canada assured readers that the turban "has no religious significance, is no sign of caste, nor social badge; nothing but a comfortable headgear."[42] Perhaps this missionary wished to erase evidence of Sikhism and bolster the number of converts he claimed by rejecting the turban's religious meaning. In any case, his statement was clearly intended to reassure Canadian readers that Sikh visual difference did not correspond to social, religious, or political difference. G. B. Lal went further, advising the Indian community in North America to eschew the turban and other non-European articles of dress in order to "establish the fact that they were 'White' persons."[43] Lal's use of "white" in quotes demonstrates the precarious liminality of Indians' racial categorization; nonetheless, he was still willing to assert that racial privilege, provided immigrants gave up those visual markers of difference that could be removed. Cleanliness, European dress, and knowledge of the English language all could be used to defend Indians' claims to whiteness.[44]

---

[41] S. E. Hassim, "Correspondence: A Plea for Equal Rights," *AC*, 3 December 1910.
[42] W. W. Baer, "The Problems of Hindu Immigration Into Canada," *Victoria Daily Times*, quoted in *Aryan*, September 1911.
[43] G. B. Lal, quoted in Confidential Report, 17 March 1920, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1548, File 4622. See also Rajani, *Hindustani Workers*, 75. One European defender argued that Indians would "look just like white gentlemen" without their turbans (Fred Lockley, "The Hindu Invasion: A New Immigration Problem," *Pacific Monthly* (1907), 194).
[44] Dr. E. H. Lawson, quoted in Rajani, *Hindustani Workers*, 75; also quoted in *A Call for Canadian Justice* (Canada India Committee Leaflet No 2, Toronto, 1915); also quoted in Anna Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada: An Appeal*; also quoted in A Hindu-Canadian, *India's Appeal to Canada or An Account of Hindu Immigration to the Dominion* (1915), 11-12; "Perambulator's Accusations against the Indians," *CIN*, September 27, 1901; C. B. Walters, *Madras Standard*, quoted in "Indians in The United States: 'The Odious Turban,'" *AC*, 5 July 1911.

While asserting their own whiteness, Indian activists capitalized on the fragility of colonial settlers' white credentials. Advocates of Indian rights depicted racism as an un-British, peculiarly colonial trait (see chapter two). Moderate Indian nationalist Gopal Gokhale argued that South Africans with "English character" and the "better section of the European community in South Africa" would oppose anti-Indian legislation. If English immigrants did tolerate such racism it was "because it was often in the nature of such environments to undermine character."[45] This language drew on familiar theories that different environments caused racial degeneration.[46] One Canadian wrote that the exclusion of Indians from Canada signaled that

> "British liberty and British fair play…all this was dead and buried here long ago…Are there no white men in Vancouver? Not one white enough to cry out shame on the meanness and dirtiness of the attitude we assume and the acts we practice? None white enough to see that fellow men shall be treated as men, and not as cattle."[47]

According to this logic, racism was not practiced by Britons nor white men. Thus, racism became a racialized vice, practiced only by those whose own whiteness was suspect. That this very argument was premised on the idea of Britain's racial superiority was obscured.

Canada: Aryanism and the Asian menace

Although Indian activists in South Africa and Canada shared several strategies for resisting anti-Indian legislation, the racialized connotations of imperial citizenship were quite different between the two colonies. In Canada, as in the US, whiteness was central to immigration rights and that whiteness was asserted through Punjabi Sikhs' claim to

[45] Gopal Gokhale, quoted in *Documents Relating to the Indian Question*, 3.
[46] Harrison, *Climates and Constitutions*; Anderson, *Cultivation*; Eves Richard, "Unsettling settler colonialism: Debates over climate and colonization in New Guinea, 1875-1914," *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 28, no. 2 (March 2005): 304-330.
[47] Ernest Munnings, "Correspondence columns: treatment of Hindus," *News Advertiser*, June 4, 1914.

Aryan identity.[48] The history of Indian immigration and the racial demographics that Indian immigrants confronted in the two colonies shaped their response to immigration restriction.

European settlers and politicians in Canada focused their energy on the larger populations of Chinese and Japanese immigrants long before they became concerned about Indian migration. Officials in British Columbia did not even broach the topic of Indian migration with their superiors in Ottawa until 1904. At that time, officials in Ottawa dismissed these concerns as unfounded, since the population of Indian immigrants was small and since Indians were "industrious" enough to be considered desirable immigrants in the West Indies.[49] Not until 1907 did the federal government begin to create legislation that specifically targeted Indian immigrants. However, as Canadians moved to ban Indian immigration, they encountered the particular challenge of barring British subjects from a British colony (see chapter two). Indian immigrants in Canada capitalized on this tension, emphatically and repeatedly differentiating themselves from the Chinese and Japanese on the grounds that Indians were imperial citizens and therefore due more consideration than foreigners. From the moderate Toronto-based professor, journalist, and activist Sunder Singh to the radical west-coast Ghadr Party leader Husain Rahim to the Hindu Friend Society run by white Christians, all unanimously agreed that immigration restriction of British subjects was a much more

[48] John Tehranian, "Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Construction of Racial Identity in America," *Yale Law Journal* 109, no. 4 (January 2000): 817-848; Charles J. McClain, "Tortuous Path, Elusive Goal: The Asian Quest for American Citizenship," *Asian Law Journal* 33 (1995): 33-61; Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 37-50.

[49] Thomas F. McGuigan to R. W. Scott, 15 September 1904, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 1; R.W. Scott to Thomas McGuigan, 23 September 1904, LAC IB RG76 Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 1 ; Deputy Minister, Dept. Trade and Commerce to Deputy Minister, Dept. Interior, 19 October 1904, LAC IB RG76 Volume 384, File 536999, Pt.1.

heinous crime than legislation imposed on Asians not subject to the Crown.[50] Such "injustice"[51] was a "humiliation"[52] that called Indians' British citizenship into question.

While the primary defense of Indians' right to immigration explicitly referenced their status as imperial citizens, this rhetoric rested on other, more racialized distinctions between Indians and the Chinese and Japanese population. British and Indian defenders of Canadian immigration rights repeatedly recycled the claims of Dr. E. H. Lawson and Walter W. Baer, editor of the *Victoria Times*, that Indians were cleaner and better workers than other Asian immigrants.[53] In addition to being quoted in petitions to the government, this quotation was also included in many pamphlets and articles published by the Friends of the Hindu Society and other activists, achieving a wide circulation in Canada and India.[54] Another frequently quoted passage described the entrance of 500 Chinese immigrants while the *Komagata Maru* passengers were kept in harbor. Sunder Singh wrote,

> "I make no invidious comparison between them and my own countrymen, but will quote from the exclusionist *Victoria* (B.C.) *Times'* account of the *Komagata Maru* passengers on the day of their arrival: … 'The majority of the men have served in the British army, and they are a tall and handsome lot. They seem superior to the class of Hindus which have already come to this province. They stand very erect and move with an alert action. All their suits were well pressed and their turbans spotlessly

[50] Shah, *Stranger Intimacy*, 216; petition from Hindu Friend Society of Victoria to SSC, 28 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; petition from Swadesh Sevak Home, 24 April 1910 to Secretary of State for India [henceforth SSI], BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; *India's Appeal*, 9; Canada India Committee, *The Hindu Case* (Toronto, 1915); Annie Besant, quoted in *The Theosophist*, in *Aryan,* November 1911.
[51] petition from the Friends of Hindustan (San Francisco) to Viceroy of India and SSI, 3 December 1910, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568.
[52] petition from Hindu Friend Society of Victoria to SSC, 28 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064 File 568 .
[53] *India's Appeal*, 11-12; Rajani, *Hindustani Workers,* 75; "Canada: Cleanliness of the Sikh," *Canada and India*, July 1915.
[54] Ibid, quoted in *Aryan*, September 1911; also quoted in *India's Appeal*, 12; also quoted in Broad, *Appeal*, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 8; also quoted in "Canada," *Canada and India*, July 1915; also quoted in Sunder Singh, "The Hindu in Canada," *The Journal of Race Development* 7, no. 3 (January 1917): 380; also quoted in Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada*.

> clean. The most of them know a little of the English language, and some of them converse in it remarkably well."[55]

This quotation used several familiar registers to demonstrate the immigrants' respectability, Britishness, and racial fitness: their military service, physical fitness, cleanliness, European dress, and English education. Singh used the cache of a white colonial newspaper—moreover, one that was staunchly opposed to Indian immigration—while simultaneously shifting the comparison from the *Victoria Times*' observation that the *Komagata Maru* passengers were preferable to previous Indian immigrants to Singh's comparison between Indian and Chinese immigrants. Ostensibly refusing to engage in racial comparisons, Singh nonetheless ventriloquized the *Victoria Times*' endorsement of racially respectable Indian immigrants and transformed its meaning by explicitly juxtaposing this with Chinese immigrants.

Differentiation of Indians from other Asian immigrants emphasized Punjabi Sikhs' moral as well as racial attributes. In response to accusations of Asian mendicancy, Ghadr Party member Ram Chandra insisted that Sikhs cared entirely for their own poor.[56] The military contributions of Punjabi Sikhs to the British empire were frequently publicized in defense of Indian immigration to Canada.[57] Military service had a racialized aspect as well as political one, as Sikh immigrants were praised for their strength, height,

[55] Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 376. Quoted also in *India's Appeal*, 9.
[56] Chandra, "Exclusion."
[57] Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 364-5; *A Call for Canadian Justice*; Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada*; petition from Hindu Friend Society in Victoria to SSI, n.d, BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; United India League and Khalsa Diwan to Ottawa, 15 December 1911, *Proof 5277 Published India Office papers*, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 9; Col. Falk Warren to Under Secretary of State for India, 2 January 1907, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 1..

and other physical attributes.[58] Radical Indian National Congress leader Lala Lajpat Rai argued that,

> "'Physically or morally the Sikhs are inferior to no other race. They are a well-built, good-looking, strong and healthy race, who have given good proofs of their bravery, resourcefulness, character, stamina, and loyalty on numerous occasions. To bang the doors against such people on the ground that they are an inferior race is arrogance amounting to criminal insolence.'"[59]

This bolstered Punjabi immigrants' masculine qualifications for settler citizenship, but it also countered fears of diseased or weak immigrants.[60] Such language used British classifications of martial races to differentiate Punjabi Sikhs from stereotypes of "effeminate" or "meek" Indians.[61] In the first article of the *Hindustanee*, Rahim insisted on the difference between Punjabis and Indians from other provinces, saying "It is earnestly desired that our readers and critics will not distract themselves and others by (**ex parte**) remarks about Bengalis and Baboos for there are none in this country."[62] Advocates of Indian immigration to Canada described Sikhism as analogous to Protestantism.[63] Sunder Singh and his followers contrasted Sikhism with other "Eastern"

---

[58] J. E. Bird, quoted in *Minutes of a Hindu Mass Meeting Held in Dominion Hall*, Vancouver, June 21, 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, Pt. 3; Saint Nihal Singh, "The Indian Immigration Crisis in South Africa," *Fortnightly Review* 95 (1914): 487.

[59] Lala Lajpat Rai, in *Westminster Gazette,* quoted in "The Colour Bar in the Colonies," *India*, 17 July 1914, 32.

[60] Natalia Molina, "Constructing Mexicans as Deportable Immigrants: Race, Disease, and the Meaning of 'Public Charge,'" *Identities* 17, no. 6 (2010): 641-66; Alison Bashford, "At the Border: Contagion, Immigration, Nation," *Australian Historical Studies* 33, no. 120 (October 2002): 344-58; "Editorial: Welcome to Komagata Maru," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.

[61] Ballantyne, *Between Colonialism and Diaspora*, 41, 61-6; Sikata Banerjee, *Make me a Man! Masculinity, Hinduism, and Nationalism in India* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), esp. 28-37; Lionel Caplan, "Martial Gurkhas: The Persistence of A British military Discourse on 'Race,'" in *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, ed. Peter Robb (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[62] "Editorial," *Hindustanee*, January 1914, emphasis in the original. The "Baboo" was stereotypical figure of the British imagination characterized by over-education, effeminacy, cowardice, and politial extremism. The figure of the Baboo was primarily associated with Bengalis. Thus, Rahim's disavowal of Bengalis and Baboos is both a racialized claim and one that distanced Indians in Canada from nationalist radicals—ironic, given Rahim's membership in the Ghadr Party.

[63] Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 380; *A Call for Canadian Justice*; Broad, *Appeal*; *India's Appeal*, 12; Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada*.

religions; it was not, they emphasized, Hinduism, Islam, or Buddhism.[64] This defense was designed to appeal to white British settlers, particularly the Christian groups that took up defense of the Indians' cause in Ottawa and Toronto. Comparisons of Protestantism and Sikhism carried racial as well as moral overtones: Sikhs were often called "the Highlanders of India," an ascription that must have resonated with Canadian settlers, many of whom were of Scottish descent.[65] Military service and Sikh reformism worked together to code Indian immigrants as British. Both of these arguments sought to demystify Indian immigrants by making them seem less Asian.

Most important to Indian activists differentiating themselves from Chinese and Japanese immigrants was the argument that Indians were Aryans. The racial theory of Aryan descent, popularized by Orientalist scholars in eighteenth and nineteenth century, posited a common heritage between English and Indians. At the same time, however, Aryanism also argued that Indians had stagnated or degenerated while the English had progressed.[66] Thomas Trautmann argues that, as a product of European colonial rule in India, Aryanism was, paradoxically, about finding commonalities between Europeans and Indians while also differentiating between the two.[67] Aryanism, like imperial citizenship, was a discourse that was simultaneously universalist and based upon hierarchical classification.

---

[64] *A Call for Canadian Justice*; Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada*; E. Munnings, "The People of India in British Columbia," *Westminster Hall Magazine and Father West Review*, December 1911; Mr. David Ross to Grain Growers' Guide of Winnipeg, quoted in "Sikh Farmers in Canada," *Aryan*, August 1912.
[65] Mr. Douglass, quoted in "Senate Debates in Canada on Monday 2 June on Indians in BC, Public, No 173," 11 July 1913, BL/IOR/ L/E/7/1200, File 355; Mrs. L. R. Broad, quoted in *Victoria Times*, quoted in "Canada: Reconsider the Whole Question," *Canada and India*, July 1915; Ross, *The Sikhs in Canada*.
[66] For an analysis of the complexities of Aryanism in nineteenth century colonial thought, see Susan Bayly, "Caste and 'Race' in the Colonial Ethnography of India," in *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, ed. Peter Robb (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995).
[67] Thomas R. Trautmann, *Aryans and British India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

Indian immigrants and their white British supporters in Canada emphasized the commonality of Aryan heritage while ignoring or countering the theories of racial degeneration.[68] In his 1915 MA thesis on Indian immigration, Indu Prakas Bannerji linked the linguistic and regional differences within India to racial origins, echoing the common argument that northern, higher-caste Indians were Aryan, while lower-class and southern Indians were Dravidian and therefore at best "aberrant Caucasians." Bannerji linked Aryan descent explicitly with skin and hair color, arguing that "The blondes are to be generally found in Cashmere, less frequently in the Punjab and Rajputana, while the higher caste people almost all over the land, excepting the Dravidian country, possess a complexion varying from dark white to olive with the characteristic features of the typical Caucasian." Aryan Indians, while not "absolutely white," were "olive-complexioned" and were only as dark as southern Europeans or Anglo-Indians.[69] Ram Chandra similarly argued that "The Hindus have the same color as the Spaniards, Mexicans, or Southern Italians"[70] and that "the Hindus of Cashmere and of several other parts of India, are as white as the fairest brunette type of any Caucasian native."[71] As "pure Aryans," Bannerji and others argued, high-caste northern Indians could be "safely admitted…without giving any offence to a self-respecting, sensitive nation."[72] This

[68] Rajani, *Hindustani Workers*, 115-6. G. D. Kumar even turned the language of Indian degeneration on its head, arguing that Indians not only shared Aryan heritage with Britons, but that Indians had been civilized while Britons were still "savages" (G. D. Kumar, quoted in "Hindu is Fellow Subject, Not Citizen*," Aryan*, May 1912). For radical Indian nationalists' uses of Aryan racial theory in the subcontinent, see: Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race*, 181-5. With very different political agendas, British Canadian reformers, often including Christian missionaries, embraced Indians as Aryan "brothers" (Rev. Dr. Wilkie, "Sikhs' Rights in Canada," *Toronto Globe*, in *Aryan*, February 1912; Broad, *Appeal*, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 8; E. Munnings, "The People of India in British Columbia," *Westminster Hall Magazine*, December 1911.
[69] Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration," 50-3.
[70] Chandra, "Exclusion."
[71] *San Francisco Call and Post*, 16 October 1916, quoted in Chandra, "Exclusion," 19-20.
[72] Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration," 50-3. See also: Jogesh Misrow, *East Indian Immigration on the Pacific Coast* (Stanford, CA: May 1915), 3; "The Sikh in Canada," from *Toronto World*, in *Aryan*, December

argument gained force from decisions by several US courts to admit high-caste Hindus as Caucasians, developments that were reported with glee by Indians in Canada and abroad and with concern by Canadian immigration officials.[73] The Indo-Canadian periodical *The Aryan*'s first issue declared that it was "published to show our friends the Westerners, that the Hindus and they are one, being sprung from the same stock…We believe the various colonies need the Hindu."[74] The *Montreal Gazette* agreed at least with part of this statement, recognizing that "the very title of the paper [*Aryan*] is an appeal. It may not have the force to-day [sic] that it had fifty years ago, but the kindly word, "Indo-European," still means much."[75] Indian immigration and Aryan racial status were intrinsically linked. Singh connected race and citizenship, stating that "The Sikhs are all British subjects and they are all of the Aryan race, the same as the Canadians, whereas the Japanese and Chinese are Mongolians."[76] Canadian Indians' claims to Aryan heritage functioned in conjunction with their status as British subjects, aligning Indian immigrants

---

1911. According to a surveillance report, G. B. Lal cautioned his audience not to ally themselves with "Bengalis and Madrasis [sic], who, owing to their contact with Mongolian elements, could probably not be correctly classed as white" (Confidential Report, 17 March 1920, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1548, File 4622). The assertion of Aryan heritage was much more common in Canada, where the immigrant population was primarily north Indian, than in South Africa, where Aryanism was only occasionally asserted (Natal Indians to Sir John Robinson, n.d., NAB CSO 1417, Minute Papers and Miscellaneous 1894, 3281/1894; petition signed by three Parsees, 17 September 1906, TAB GOV LEER Volume 202.

[73] "Notes: A Hindu admitted to U.S.A. Citizenship," *Modern Review*, August 1914; "A Hindu Can Become an American Citizen: Brahmans are the best Representatives of the Indo-German Stock," *IE*, August 1914; "Hindu Accepted as American Citizen," *Daily Province*, 3 May 1913, enclosed in Reid to Scott, 5 May 1913, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 5. South African Indians followed these developments as well, remarking that "while the American Government is willing to admit that Indians are Whites…the South African Government should never feel tired of pouring contumely on their devoted head by the insulting and irritating repetitions of the term coloured" ("In It and Still Out of It," *Mahratta*, quoted in *AC*, 2 August 1913).

[74] *Aryan*, August 1911. See also: "News and Notes," *Aryan*, December 1911.

[75] *Montreal Gazette*, quoted in "As Others See Us: Montreal Gazette Makes National and Imperial Review of the Hindu Question," *Aryan*, December 1911.

[76] Sunder Singh, quoted in "Hindoos Object to Being Class with Mongolians," *The Star*, in *Aryan*, January 1912. See also: Sunder Singh, quoted in Broad, *Appeal*; G. D. Kumar, quoted in "Hindu is Fellow Subject, Not Citizen," *Aryan*, May 1912; Bannerji, "Hindu Immigration," 40.

with white Canadians in both racial and political terms, while marking Chinese and Japanese immigrants as doubly foreign as both Asians and aliens.

Many European Canadian settlers and politicians, however, hotly contested the idea that Indians were Aryans.[77] The violently racist *Saturday Sunset* responded to *The Aryan's* publication saying that if Indians were Aryans "someone must have muddied the strain…If he could peroxide himself white it wouldn't make any difference."[78] Simultaneously utilizing and rejecting skin color as a determinant of race, the *Sunset* insisted on its definition of racial difference over scholarly classifications. The test case for the *Komagata Maru* immigrants, *Re Munshi Singh* reveals the fragile and arbitrary nature of racial classification. Judges in the Munshi Singh case argued that regardless of scholarly definitions of racial groups, Singh could not be considered a white man as the law intended to define it. Justice McPhillips cited several scholars in his argument that shared language and even shared descent did not indicate real consanguinity.[79] He then rejected the scholarly definitions of race as irrelevant to legal cases. "[W]e must be content to use those words ["race" and "nation"]…without being able to prove that our use of them is accurate as mathematicians judge of accuracy." According to this judgment, "Asiatic race" in the Order in Council under question were "comprehensive and precise enough to cover the Hindu race." Moreover, "the Hindu race as well as the Asiatic race in general are…fundamentally different to the Anglo-Saxon and Celtic

---

[77] Col. Sir Thomas Hungerford Hodich, quoted in *Report of the Komagata Maru Committee of Inquiry and Some Further Documents* (Calcutta: Government of India, 1915; Chandigarh: Unistar Books Pvt. Ltd, 2007), 159.

[78] *Saturday Sunset*, quoted in "Canada's Warm Welcome and Christian Greetings to Fellow-Subjects from the Hindustan," *Aryan*, September 1911. On another occasion, the *Sunset* declared, "The Sikh may be of Aryan stock; I always though he was of Jewish extraction. He may be near-white, though he doesn't look it…British Columbia cannot allow any more of the dark meat of the world to come into this province" (*Vancouver Sunset*, quoted in "Practicing the Ten Commandments," *Aryan*, March-April 1912).

[79] Justice McPhillips, Court of Appeal in the Matter of the Immigration Act and in the Matter of Munshi Singh, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, part 4

races."[80] McPhillips' rejection of the scientific racism mobilized by Singh's defense in favor of a "common sense" racism anticipated by several years a similar argument in the more famous 1923 Bhagat Singh Thind case in the United States.[81] While Indians in Canada and the US cited European scholars in defense of their claims to Aryan heritage,[82] many European settlers rejected racial theory in order to enforce racist laws.[83]

Caught in the racialized webs of imperial rule and nationalist nativism, Indian migrants struggled to assert their rights as British subjects, a term that led implicitly to concomitant claims of racial superiority to other groups. In Canada, that claim expressed itself particularly through the language of Aryanism: Punjabi Sikhs used their ethnic unity to argue that they were not Asian, that they were, in fact, Aryan.[84] Amongst Canadian Indians, therefore, the whitening connotations of imperial citizenship were made explicit: Indian immigrants proclaimed themselves to be white settlers alongside those of British origin.

South Africa: British subjects, British Indians

In South Africa, Indians faced an entirely different demographic and political situation and defined themselves accordingly in very different racial terms. Since Indians were the primary target of anti-Asiatic sentiment in South Africa, comparing Indians with

---

[80] Ibid.

[81] For a study of the Thind case, see Harold A. Gould, *Sikhs, Swamis, Students, and Spies: The India Lobby in the United States, 1900-1946* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2006), ch 7; Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 38-50.

[82] Chandra, "Exclusion," 21-3.

[83] The South African case provides similar evidence of settler state's indifference to the the kind of racial/national distinctions that Indians were eager to enforce. Chinese passive resisters deported to India along with Indian passive resisters. Ironically, as Kornel Chang has argued in the case of the US and Canada, white settler states ignored some national boundaries when it suited their larger goal of enforcing racial and national borders (Chang, "Enforcing," 693).

[84] In South Africa, where there was a substantial South Indian population, references to Aryan heritage were much scarcer and were usually evoked by specifically Sikh or Parsee communities. See for example, Petition signed by three Parsees, 17 September, 1906, TAB GOV LEER Volume 202; petition from Parsees to Chairman and Members of the Constitutional Committee, n.d. [1906?], TAB GOV LEER Volume 951, 15/12/1906.

other Asian immigrants was not a useful tactic. In addition, the Transvaal British Indian Association allied with the Transvaal Chinese Association during the passive resistance movement. As a result, unfavorable comparisons between Chinese and Indians were rare. For instance, Gokhale made a point of saying that although the Chinese and Indian alliance proved that "'adversity makes strange bedfellows,'" he did not object to the Indians being classed with Chinese because they were both from ancient civilizations.[85] Such an approach avoided the more racialized, disparaging comparisons that were prevalent amongst Canadian Indians.

Unsurprisingly, advocates of Indian rights in South Africa frequently contrasted them with black Africans. Racial legislation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century increasingly grouped Indians and Africans together, leading supporters of Indian rights to protest strenuously against this classification. Being legally classed with Africans excluded Indians from the vote, segregated Indians in separate areas of town from Europeans, imposed inconvenient restrictions on travel, and made doing business with Europeans much more difficult.[86] The TBIA noted that such laws were "at once humiliating and inconvenient."[87] These laws were especially galling to upper-class

[85] "Chinese and Indians: Bond of brotherhood: Imperial Intervention," *AC*, 23 November 1912. When comparisons did arise, they were usually limited to pointing out that Indians were British subjects and therefore more deserving of immigration rights and imperial protection. See for example: ("State of the Indian Outlanders: Indians in Australia," *Indian Review*, quoted in *AC*, 8 July 1911). Desai and Vahed point out that this was most likely a pragmatic response to the South African govnerment's insistence on treating Indians and Chinese as legally identical, despite Gandhi's (and other Indian activists') unease at being classed with "wild, murderous, and immoral" "Kaffir" and Chinese prisoners (Gandhi quoted in Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 130-1; see also Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 126).
[86] Edward Rooth to Conynham Greene, 2 December 1897, *Further Correspondence [October 18, 1897, to December 15, 1898] on the subject of Affairs in the South African Republic. In continuation of African No. 536; continued by African No. 571* (Colonial Office, March 1899), CO 879/51, No. 543, No. 103; petition of John Frazer Parker (Pretoria) to Joseph Chamberlain, 23 May 1899, *Proof No 15507* BL/IOR/ L/PJ/6/516, File 1445; petition from British Indian subjects in Natal to SSC, 10 July 1909, NAB CSO 1875, 4112/1909.
[87] petition from TBIA to Provincial Council of the Transvaal, enclosed in SABIC to SSC, 26 June 1911, SAB GG LEER Volume 889, 15/151

Indians because they made no distinction between indentured Indians and the "respectable" Indians who wore European dress, spoke English, and had professional careers.[88] On hearing that black, coloured, and Indian passengers would be required to ride in the back seats of Durban city tram cars, Aiyar was particularly aggravated to find that this restriction would apply to "coloured and Indian gentlemen of Europeanised [sic] style of living."[89]

Anti-black rhetoric was frequent. Scholars of imperial citizenship and Indian immigration to South Africa have emphasized how often Indian activists' assertion of their rights rested upon the denial of those rights to black Africans.[90] Gandhi was particularly representative of this tendency. Despite politicized depictions of Gandhi as the forerunner of the anti-apartheid movement, throughout his time in South Africa Gandhi consistently distanced himself from African and Coloured activists like John Dube, Solomon Plaatje, and Abdullah Abdurahman; supported imperial violence during the Bambatha Rebellion; and saw Indians as distinct from and superior to Africans.[91] When the Natal legislature banned Indians from owning firearms, a restriction that already applied to Africans, *Indian Opinion* insisted "justice will never be done to the Asiatic unless he is treated as apart from the Native."[92] This was not just about differentiating between the two groups, but was rooted in Indian ideas' of racial superiority. In 1894, Natal Indians wrote petitions to Natal's Colonial Secretary and Premier and to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, protesting the Natal Franchise Act

[88] petition from Natal Indians to SSC, July 1894, NAB CSO 1417A; M. K. Gandhi, *Notes on the Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa*, 22 September 1896, GLDC HIST 1906/1914.
[89] "Restricting Tram facilities," *AC*, 28 May 1910.
[90] Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya*, 4, 11, 16, 54, 68; Mawani, "Spectres," 13-15; Hofmeyr et al, "Print Cultures," 14; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 10-11; Banerjee, *Becoming*, 106-7.
[91] Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*.
[92] "The Anti-Indian Activity of Natal," *IO*, 25 March 1905.

on the grounds that it "would rank the Indian lower than the rawest native."[93] During the Transvaal passive resistance movmenet, one lawyer argued that "He [the defendant] considered that it was a disgrace and a degradation that he, an educated man, should have to carry about a Kaffir pass. He came from the same stock as those who had passed the Law requiring this…Mr. Feroze looks, for all the world, like a European, and dresses and lives like one."[94] Similiarly, another defendant testified, "'I don't see why I should go round in a civilised country carrying a pass as if I were a kafir [sic]—a bond of slavery.'"[95] Indicating Indians' Aryan descent, and defending themselves on racial and class axes, these defendents asserted their difference from Africans, whom they and other Indian activists considered to be racially inferior. Indians, they insisted, came from an ancient civilization that was more advanced than that of African "savages."[96] The Muslim League echoed common sentiments when it stated that Afrikaners "fail to sufficiently recognise the very wide distinction between the highly organised and ancient civilisation of India and the semi-barbarous condition and outlook of the Kaffir."[97]

Despite this racism, by the 1910s, some activists were making nascent moves towards Indian-African political alliances. Unlike the older merchant immigrant population, some colonial-born activists were more willing to align themselves, at least rhetorically, with African and Coloured political movements. Aiyar's papers, which were

[93] petition from Natal Indians to SSC, July 1894, NAB CSO 1417A..
[94] "Notes on the Transvaal Struggle," *IO*, 27 February 1909.
[95] Ibid. See also Gandhi's statement on Indians in "the new colonies" [Transvaal and ORC] (7 April 1903), enclosed in letter from Dadabhai Naoroji, 7 April 1903, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/628, File 402.
[96] "The Indian Grievances in South Africa and the Urgency of Redress," *India*, in *CIN*, 11 October 1902; Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree to Chamberlain, 15 September 1903, in *Transvaal Correspondence relating to the Position of British Indians in the Transvaal Cd. 2239* (London: Darling and Son, Ltd., Her Majesty's Stationery Office, August 1904) BL/IOR/L/PARL/2/371; "Tram Cars and Indian [sic]," *AC*, 21 May 1910; "The London All-India Moslem League Representation: On the British Indians Question in South Africa, (cont'd from last issue)," *AC*, 14 January 1911.
[97] All-India Muslim League, quoted in "British East African Indians' Grievances: Moslem League's Representation," *AC*, 4 February 1911.

directed at the colonial-born population, reported much more frequently than *Indian Opinion* on the African Political Organization, the South African Native National Congress, and even African American political movements.[98] Meanwhile, organizations like the African People's Organization urged Indians, Africans, and the Coloured population to unify against white racism.[99] While in 1909 *African Chronicle* argued that "The Indians, having great traditions, would be at a great disadvantage to throw in their lot with other sections of the Coloured,"[100] by April 1910 fear of disenfranchisement under the South African Union had the paper declaring, "We must have the South African Coloured Union an accomplished fact."[101] Indian-African political alliances were frequently constrained by Indian attempts to frame themselves as the leaders and Africans as the political children.[102] However, *African Chronicle* urged its readers to adopt political ideas like the boycott of Union Day from the APO.[103] In the fearful months before Union, *African Chronicle* went so far as to state that "the black man, including the Asiatics, are very anxious to know whether the British would be the real predominating

[98] Aryan [pseud.], "Correspondence: Tax on Indians," *AC*, 26 September 1908; "Segregation of the Coloured People," *AC,* 23 March 1912; "African Native Congress," *AC*, 29 March 1913. It's particularly interesting that a correspondent who used the pseudonym "Aryan" would favorably compare African women's opposition to the hut tax with Indian women's petition against the £3 tax on ex-indentured laborers. Evidently the racial designation of Aryan did not always preclude cross-racial political recognition, if not solidarity.
[99] APO resolution, quoted in "A. P. O. Conference Resolution," *AC*, 26 March 1910; Observer [pseud.], "Current Topics: Notes and Comments: Union and Coloured People," *AC*, 18 June 1910; "Dr. Rubanza on the Coloured Question," *AC*, 22 October 1910; "Legislation for Coloured People," *AC*, March 22, 1913.
[100] "The Union bill," *AC*, 21 August 1909.
[101] "Coloured Amalgamation," *AC*, 2 April 1910.
[102] For a condescending description of Gandhi's effect on John Dube's politics, see the typescript translation of an account by Raojibhai M. Patel who in 1914 went with Gandhi and W. W. Pearson to meet John Dube (typescript translation, Raojibhai M. Patel, *Gandhiji Ni Sadhna*, English trans. E. S. Reddy (Navajivan Press, 1939; Hindi translation Navajivan Press, 1951; English translation n.d.) GLDC HIST 1893/1914).
[103] APO resolution, quoted in "A. P. O. Conference Resolution," *AC*, 26 March 1910; Observer [pseud.], "Notes on Current Topics: A Very Bold Step," *AC*, 7 May 1910; "Our Royal Visitors," *AC,* 3 December 1910.

factor or the Boers."[104] In this case, racial-national divisions between British and Afrikaner were deemed more important than the difference between black, Coloured, and Asian populations. Although the *African Chronicle*'s articles never seemed to generate more substantial political cooperation, they provide a necessary counterpoint to histories of Indian-African politics that have focused solely on Gandhi's attitudes.

For the most part, South African Indian rhetoric focused on comparisons with Europeans: primarily Jewish immigrants and Afrikaners. Unsurprisingly, when confronted with the complex racial hierarchy of the South African landscape, in which a black/white binary was the desired outcome but the stratification of coloured, Asian, and not-quite-white European immigrants remained unclear, Indians chose to look up the racial hierarchy when making their claims for national and imperial belonging. However, whereas in Canada defenders of Indian immigration focused on their Aryan heritage or whiteness, in South Africa claiming a blanket whiteness was insufficient protection. It was not enough to be white, one must be specifically *British*. This definition of Britishness was constructed in contrast to European immigrants, particularly Jews, and ultimately against Afrikaners.

Indian arguments against Jewish immigration drew on many of the same themes of class, education, capacity for democracy, and cleanliness that characterized Canadian Indian attacks on Chinese immigrants. This language, not coincidentally, resonated with white settler arguments against Indian immigration in both Canada and South Africa. South Africa, like other parts of the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, saw increasing numbers of Eastern European Jews fleeing poverty and anti-Semitic violence. As in the United States and Britain at this time, South African Jews'

[104] "Mr. Smuts on the South African Problem," *AC*, 9 October 1909.

whiteness was very much in question.[105] While Gandhi's collaboration with British Jews such as H. S. L. Polak, L. W. Ritch, and Herman Kallenbach led him to make periodic calls for Jewish-Indian solidarity,[106] Gandhi's paper *Indian Opinion* often joined other South African Indian periodicals in racist attacks on the "scum of Europe."[107] South African Indians emphasized their status as British subjects, but more importantly their familiarity with British customs and traditions, to defend their right to immigrate over the immigration of poverty-stricken foreign Jews who were incapable of assimilation.[108]

Whereas in Canada, the Chinese were the "bad" Asian immigrants against whom Indians defined themselves, in South Africa, Indians framed Jewish immigrants as the unworthy Asians destroying the nation.[109] *Indian Opinion* responded to one legislator's call for a white South Africa by declaring that "practically every 'Asiatic from Jerusalem,' like Sir Richard Solomon, his brother E. P. Harry Solomon, Harry Graumann, Richard Goldmann, Emile Nathan, Julius Jeppe, and I. M. Goodman—there may be others for aught I know—are as bitterly anti-Asiatic as possible!"[110] This indictment resonated with British claims that racial segregation was the result of foreign and

---

[105] Anthony S. Wohl, " 'Dizzi ben Dizzi': Disraeli as Alien," *Journal of British Studies* 34, no. 3 (July 1995): 375-411; Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Colour,* esp. ch 7;.

[106] Admittedly, this usually took the form of castigating Jews for not supporting Indian immigration. "Oppressor and Oppressed," *IO*, 18 August 1906; L. W. Ritch, in *South African Jewish Chronicle*, quoted in "Jews and Indians in the Transvaal: An Interesting Incident," *IO*, 18 April 1908; "The Turn of the Tide," *IO*, 14 December 1907.

[107] "Lower than the Scum of Europe," *Bombay Gazette*, quoted in *AC*, 13 November 1909; *Natal Mercury* , quoted in "European Scums vs. Asiatics," *AC*, 24 December 1910; F. G. Stone, "A White South Africa," in *North American Review*, quoted in "Our Weekly London Letter: From Our Special Correspondent: Hit the Bull's Eye," *IO*, 7 October 1905; Sir Lepel Griffin, quoted in "Elgin Interview: Official Report: Full Text: Eloquent Tributes: Sir Lepel Griffin's Sympathy: Other Speeches," *IO*, 15 December 1906.

[108] Gandhi, *Indian Franchise*, 4; Singh, "Indian Immigration Crisis," *Fortnightly Review* 95 (1914): 494; Hajee Habib, quoted in "Lord Selborne and British Indians in the Transvaal," *IO*, 9 December 1905, 828; "Alien Immigration," *IO*, 10 November 1906; Observer [pseud.], "Durban Notes: An Old Fable," *IO*, 1 December 1906, 900; "The Indian Scapegoat," *IO*, 4 December 1909.

[109] *Review of Reviews*, quoted in "The Position of the Indians," *IO*, 12 May 1906; "A Fine Distinction," *IO*, 26 June 1909.

[110] "Johannesburg Jottings: From Our Transvaal Representative," *IO*, 23 February 1907.

Afrikaner settlers, rather than Britons.[111] This accusation depicted Jews as racially Asian while also implying that anti-Asian legislation was a Jewish rather than a British obsession. This maneuver ironically depicted anti-Asian racism as un-British, while simultaneously directing anti-Asian prejudice against Jewish immigrants by depicting them as "Asiatics from Jerusalem." South African immigration laws evaded explicit racial barriers by imposing a linguistic test in which immigration officials could choose any European language with which to determine the immigrant's level of literacy. Taking their cue from legislative debates over what languages should count as European,[112] *Indian Opinion* argued that Yiddish was an Asiatic language and should therefore not be allowed.[113] Moreover, they argued, why should Yiddish, a foreign language with a "bastard" history, be preferred over the civilized, ancient, Aryan, and (because of the Raj) *British* languages of Bengali, Hindi, Gujarati, and Tamil.[114] Poor, marginalized, and in economic competition with Indian merchants, the Eastern European Jewish population made an excellent scapegoat against which Indian immigrants could present themselves as the ideal British settlers.

---

[111] Sir Lepel Griffin, quoted in Nundy, *Exposure*, 54; F. G. Stone, "A White South Africa," *North American Review*, quoted in "Our Weekly London Letter: From our Special Correspondent: Hit the Bull's Eye," *IO*, 7 October 1905; Sir Lepel Grifin, quoted in "Elgin Interview: Official Report: Full Text: Eloquent Tributes: Sir Lepel Griffin's Sympathy: Other Speeches," *IO*, 15 December 1906; *Morning Post*, quoted in "What the British Press Says," Supplement to 'Indian Opinion' Wednesday, Nov. 19th, 1913, n.p.

[112] "Is Yiddish an Eastern Language," *IO*, 11 June 1903; "Immigration Restriction Bill in Parliament," *IO*, 2 July 1903; "Cape Immigration Act," *IO*, 7 May 1904; "Cape Immigration Act," *IO*, 7 May 1904. In one telling episode, the Cape Colony counted Yiddish as a European language for immigration purposes but not for a law on book-keeping regulations, thus grouping Jewish traders with other Asian merchants in order to restrict their economic mobility. *Indian Opinion* observed, "Apparently the Government when it suits them can Europeanise [sic] a language for enforcing one law, and de-Europeanise [sic] it for enforcing another" ("Cape General Dealers' Bill," *IO*, 18 March 1905).

[113] L. W. Ritch, quoted in "The S. A. British Indian Committee's Reply to General Smuts," *IO*, 31 August 1907. This seems to be a bizarre demonstration of linguistic and historical ignorance, given that both Ritch, the author of the letter, and Polak, the editor of *IO*, were Jewish, albeit not from Eastern Europe.

[114] British Indians in Cape Town to SSI, n.d. [received 23 March 1905], BL/IOR/L/PJ/713, File 753; "Johannesburg Jottings: From Our Transvaal Representative," *IO*, 20 July 1907; "Meeting of Mahomedans in London: On the Transvaal Situation," *India*, quoted in *IO*, 28 December 1907; "Gratitude for Privileges," *IO*, 30 June 1906.

The ultimate racial comparison for South African Indians, however, was to define themselves as imperial citizens and Britons in contrast to Afrikaners. Indians drew on prevailing British-Afrikaner tensions to depict anti-Indian racism as a singularly Afrikaner trait. The argument, common to British as well as Indian politicians, that Afrikaners were more racist than British colonists, while patently untrue, created a discursive climate in which explicitly racial legislation could be attacked as pro-Boer and un-British. This rhetoric ignored British and Indian complicity in the imperial settler project. Yet it served both Indians and Britons well, giving moral superiority to Anglo expansion and Indian immigration alike, as both British and Indian South African communities presented themselves as benevolent colonizers, in contrast to Boer boors. Bhownaggree observed that while Afrikaners put racist laws on the books due to their "natural temperament," such temperament also ensured that they enforced the laws laxly.[115] In contrast, the British, rigid and lacking in imagination but dedicated to order, enforced with "strict British regularity" any laws on the books, even those they might disagree with.[116] Naturalizing Boer racism as endemic to their character (in contrast with the British settlers who were considered to be "infected" with racism), Bhownaggree's rhetoric contrasted lazy Afrikaners with methodical and rule-bound Britons. Several South African Indian petitioners took this argument further, arguing that the Afrikaners were intolerant because they were mixed-race and mixed-race settlers "are much given to be intolerant."[117] By locating racial prejudice exclusively in the Afrikaner population,

[115] Bhownaggree, quoted in *India,* quoted in "The Caxton Hall Meeting: Indignation Against the Transvaal: Strong Resolutions," *IO*, 21 November 1908.
[116] Circular 20 April 1901, GLDC HIST 1905/1914.
[117] Petition from South African Indians to Lord Curzon, March 1903, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/628, File 402. See also: "Indians in the Transvaal," *IO* 5 August 1905; Nundy, *Exposure*, 40; "Coloured Amalgamation," *AC*, 2 April 1910.

Indian activists and their supporters were able, ironically, to pathologize racial prejudice as a racial trait of the Afrikaners, foreign to British nature and practice.[118]

It is striking that in South African Indians newspapers and speeches, no differentiation was made between Afrikaners of different political inclinations or socio-economic, educational, or provincial background. Attacks on "Boers" rarely differentiated between Afrikaner populations from the Cape Colony, the Transvaal, or the Orange River Colony, except occasionally to paint the ORC as the most racist colony in South Africa.[119] Nor did pamphlets or petitions recognize any Afrikaner politicians other than Louis Botha and Jan Smuts. Rather, just as the South African government considered Gandhi to be representative of the entire Indian community, South African Indian activists treated Botha and Smuts, especially Smuts, as stand-ins for the entire range of Afrikaner experience and opinion. In part, this was because Afrikaners were a minority in Natal, the province with the largest Indian population, while Botha and Smuts' Het Volk Party dominated Transvaal politics after the Anglo-Boer war. For practical purposes, Botha and Smuts were the Afrikaner politicians who most closely affected Indian affairs, first in the Transvaal and later as South African Prime Minister and Minister of Interior Affairs. However, it is interesting that Indian activists rarely discussed either J. B. M. Hertzog's or D. F. Malan's more radical Afrikaner nationalism or the Cape Colony's more imperialist Afrikaner Bond.[120] When Hertzog or Malan were mentioned, it was usually to argue that Botha and Smuts secretly or openly agreed with them, undermining the Het Volk's and later the Unionist Party's claim to be more

[118] *Union Citizen* quoted in "The 'Union Citizen' and British Indians," *IO*, 24 December 1910.
[119] "The British Indian in South Africa: Orange River colony," *IO*, 18 June 1903; "The Orange River Colony and Asiatics," *IO*, 25 March 1905.
[120] One *African Chronicle* article did worry that "the spirit of Hertzogism [sic] [seems] likely to contaminate Natal sooner, or later" (General News," *AC*, 11 June 1910)

imperialist than Hertzog's National Party.[121] As one *African Chronicle* article observed, "the way even the talking Unionists voted with the back-velders [sic] and Hertzogists [sic], lead us to the inferance [sic] that in this country that proverbial sense of fairplay [sic] and British Justice has ceased to exist!"[122] In other words, it was futile to distinguish between different shades of Afrikaner nationalism when there seemed to be no distinction amongst Afrikaners in their treatment of Indians.

Responding to rhetoric that depicted Indians as ignorant and uncivilized brutes, Indians turned these arguments against Afrikaners. Emphasizing India's history, they argued that they were far more civilized than Afrikaners, whom they stereotyped as ignorant, uneducated, and unclean backwoodsmen. Bhownaggree was outraged that "a little snobbing Boer community had unnecessarily humiliated millions of Indians, who possessed an infinitely older civilization than they."[123] An anonymous newspaper correspondent argued that the "snobbish Boer Autocrats" were only a few centuries ago "nothing but barbarians."[124] The ill-treatment of the passive resisters in prison prompted an impassioned editorial from *African Chronicle* in which Afrikaners were attacked as "perverted" and "barbarous" "ignorant mummies…[who were] disgraced in the eyes of the civilised world."[125] In a racist and dehumanizing metaphor that compared Botha—and by extension, all Afrikaners—to black Africans and pigs, the *African Chronicle* argued that just "as 'an Ethiopian cannot change his skin' a Boer cannot change his nature despite all manner of top-dressing….Coming from the free and enlightened atmosphere of Britain he [Botha] straightaway returns and wallows with his fellow Boers in the mud

[121] "Notes & Comments: The Split in the Cabinet," *AC*, 18 January 1913.
[122] "The Duty of the South African Indians," *AC*, 17 May 1913.
[123] Bhownaggree, quoted in "Comments & Notes," *AC*, 24 October 1908.
[124] Sanatani [pseud.], "Random Thoughts," *AC*, 31 October 1908.
[125] "An Outrageous Act," *AC*, 27 March 1909.

of bigotry, prejudice and jaundiced racialism."[126] The association of Botha with "top-dressing" (a method of fertilization) and mud denigrated him and other Afrikaners as farmers rather than statesmen. As seen above, class status was deeply implicated in racial assignments. The accusation that Afrikaners were ignorant farmers undermined their right to hold political office (see also chapter two). One speaker at a Pietermaritzburg public meeting warned that South African magistrates were ignorant of English law because they "had only risen from Zulu interpreters," dismissing Afrikaner judges as uneducated lower-class clerks. The author concluded, "The Englishmen [sic] was an Englishman to the backbone, but the Beer [sic] was not."[127] The fact that this tautology was deemed worthy of repetition in several newspapers demonstrates how completely "Englishman" was imbued with classist and gendered assumptions about "gentlemanly" behavior that underwrote racial assignments. The Afrikaner could not be an Englishman as long as he remained racist, but the Indian might become an Englishman through proper behavior. Afrikaners' racism marked them as racially suspect, and certainly incapable of appreciating British values, in contrast to Indians, who presented themselves as thoroughly enmeshed in British culture and civilization.

Settlers and Farmers: Indian diaspora and the settler imaginary in Africa and Canada

Imperial citizenship and nationalism fueled and were fueled by Indians' participation in the logics and practice of settler colonialism. Recent scholarly work recognizes the role that Indians played as sub-imperial agents in colonizing other parts of

[126] "Gen. Botha's Pious Wish," *AC*, 7 October 1911. "Top-dressing" was particularly useful in warm climates. The metaphor thus anticipated the connection in the next sentence between Afrikaners and pigs (excrement being a common fertilizer), stigmatized Afrikaners, particularly General Botha, as farmers rather than statesmen, and intimated that even top-dressing was insufficient to make Botha's veneer of sophistication acquired in the northern climes last upon his return to South Africa.
[127] "Indian Strike," *Natal Mercury*, in *AC*, 6 December 1913. See also: "the Boers have power who are an ungentlemanly lot" (A. Royeppen, "Correspondence," *AC*, 26 December 1908).

the world, particularly in the Indian Ocean littoral.[128] Elite activists invoked the desirable role of settler to counter the rhetoric of unwanted immigrant. While "immigrant" carried with it overtones of undesirability and vulnerability, "settler" connoted racial superiority and an implicit right to entry and settlement. As immigrants, Indians were alien others; as settlers, they presented themselves as an integral part of the British imperial project.[129] Indians thus participated in the logics of settler colonialism which naturalized the appropriation and alienation of the indigenous population's land and labor. Yet, again, the dynamics of this settler logic appeared differently in the two colonies.

European settler colonialism was premised on the belief that only Europeans could make the lands they occupied truly productive. As a result, Europeans were adamant that Indians could not be settlers because Indian history was supposedly one of stagnation rather than progress.[130] Stevens declared: "The Hindu is not an agriculturalist…He is not a pioneer."[131] At best, European colonists insisted that Indians must take their colonizing impulses elsewhere. Especially in Canada, anti-Asian activists

[128] Metcalf, *Imperial Connections*; Nair, "Shops and Stations"; Priya Satia, "Developing Iraq: Britain, India and the Redemption of Empire and Technology in the First World War," *Past and Present* 197, no. 1 (2007) : 211-255; Aiyar, *Indians in Kenya*; James R. Brennan, "Politics and Business in the Indian newspapers of Colonial Tanganyika," *Africa* 81, no. 1 (2011): 42-67.

[129] In contemporary politics, the valences of the terms "immigrant" and "settler" have changed somewhat, with settler carrying a more negative charge in (some) circles than immigrant. Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, for instance, worry that referring to non-European migrants as settlers erases the conditions of involuntary and semi-voluntary migration through which many African and Asian peoples came to the Western hemisphere (Sharma and Wright, "Decolonizing Resistance"). They argue that this positions people of color as equally complicit with white Europeans in the violence of settler colonialism, whereas using the term migrant allows for more nuanced histories of power and racism.

[130] *Hindu Immigration*, LAC Stevens Papers [henceforth SP] MG27 III B9, Volume 165, Folder, Oriental Immigration Hindu Question December-February 1911-1912; H. H. Stevens, *The Oriental Problem: Dealing With Canada as Affected by the Immigration of Japanese, Hindu and Chinese*, n.d., LAC SP MG27 III B9, Volume 172, folder Immigration, Correspondence and Clippings (Hindu) 1914; Richard Jebb, quoted in "An Imperial Problem: Asiatic Immigration," *Times*, quoted in *IO*, 23 May 1908.

[131] H. H. Stevens, "Put up the Bars on Immigration: Mr. Stevens, M.P., at Canadian Club Luncheon, Says Canada Should Place a Higher Valuation on Its Citizenship: Duty of the Empire Demands Prompt Action," *New Adventure*, 10 July 1913, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 6..

urged Indians to colonize Latin America, or Africa.[132] In South Africa, European settlers argued that Indian settlement might be welcome in East Africa or the Middle East.[133] One Canadian writer proposed that since Africa "would suit the Hindoos better climatically than Canada" and might also "be of service to the United States for attractive optional colonization by its 'colored' population," the United States and Britain might swap Alaska for African territory. "Irrespective of the alleged 'natural resources' of the northern country," this author clearly believed that the trade would be worthwhile if Indians and Africans alike could be shipped off to Africa, relieving North Americans of their "race problem" and allowing European Canadians to expand into Alaska (presumably without encountering any troublesome Native Americans).[134] Although this "Epoch-Making Opportunity for Anglo-Saxons" was never pursued, the suggestion is representative of the settler mindset, in which territories and populations could be exchanged willy-nilly. In claiming to be settlers alongside Europeans, Indians were challenging the racial hierarchy that depicted them as passive subjects to be colonized. At the same time, however, Indians who depicted themselves as settlers entered into the logics of settler colonialism, including the civilizing mission, the myth of empty space, and the superiority of capitalist agriculture to other forms of land use.

Indian activists countered European settlers "whites-only" policy with assertions of Indians' physical, mental, and moral capacity for settlement. *African Chronicle* responded to Smuts' assertion that South Africa was a white man's country with the

[132] Robert Blake (Conservative Association) to Stevens, 3 February 1912, LAC SP MG27 III B9, Volume 165, Folder, Oriental Immigration Hindu Question December-February 1911-1912; K. J. Grant to Reid, 20 December 1913, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 2, Microfilm Reel M-3..
[133] "Speech of General Smuts in Durban August 26 1919 to Indian community," in *Documents Relating to the New Asiatic Bill*, 21.
[134] Anon., "An Epoch-Making Opportunity for Anglo-Saxons," *Westminster Hall Magazine*, July 1914.

reminder that "the British Empire, of which South Africa is an integral part, has been built up by races and creeds and civilisation [sic] of various shades."[135] A few months later, the same newspaper presented a history of Indian imperialism that predated European power in the Indian Ocean.

> "Long before the days of Vasco de [sic] Gama, Hindoo merchants have crossed the Indian Ocean…and have founded trade settlements in various parts of East Africa. It is the Indian capital, and the Indian labour that has made British East Africa as it is. It is the Sikh solders who conquered the country for England, and pacified the natives for the Imperial power…an Indian, Mr. Jeevanjee has built every government and official building in the protectorate including the house of the Governor-General himself…our readers would naturally feel a just indignation to read that England has made it 'a white man's country right down to the ground.'"[136]

By drawing a line of continuity between early modern Indian merchants and Sikh soldiers in the British army, *African Chronicle* defended Indian labor and capital as an integral part of the British Empire, and Indian laborers and capitalists as equal heirs to the rights of settlement in East Africa. According to the British Indian Association, "it is only partially true that this country has been won by the white man," given the service of Indian soldiers, bearers, and camp followers in the Anglo-Boer and Zulu wars.[137] As laborers, traders, and soldiers, Indians were equal settlers and colonizers alongside Europeans. These arguments would reach their peak expression in the 1920s as Indians in East Africa contested the Devonshire settlement,[138] but they were clearly present in South Africa in the early years of the twentieth century.

---

[135] "Mr. Smuts' [sic] Eulogium of the Empire," *AC*, 13 August 1910.
[136] "Indians in British East Africa," *AC*, 15 October 1910. See also: Bombay memorial, quoted in "Indians in Colonies: East Africa," *AC*, 28 September 1912; Gandhi, quoted in "Indians in East Africa," *Mahratta*, quoted in *IV*, 23 January 1920; Polak, "Reign of Terror in East Africa," *Modern Review*, quoted in *IE*, November-December 1916.
[137] Petition from TBIA to Governor General (Transvaal), 8 June 1903, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/628, File 402.
[138] Gregory, *India and East Africa*, chapters six through fourteen; Sinha, "Strange Death," 37-8; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 69.

Particularly in the Indian Ocean arena, the idea of "Greater India" was promoted by Indian nationalists as part of and independent from British imperial expansion.[139] *Indian Opinion* depicted the Indian diaspora as a corollary to the British diaspora, in which "India is playing in some sort the part of a mother-country, just as Great Britain has sent her own stock to people North America, Australasia, and South Africa."[140] Assertions of India's historical overseas exploration countered British imperial assumptions that India was a land of stagnation and that Europeans were inherently better suited to be colonizers.[141] Hofmeyr identifies Greater India as a form of diasporic nationalism that was "anticolonial and colonizing at the same time."[142] Concepts such as Greater India, overseas Indians, or colonial-born Indians were anticolonial in that they challenged white settler racial superiority. At the same time, the rhetoric of Greater India supported settler expansion, either erasing indigenous presence (as in Canada) or justifying Indian settlers as preferable, more civilized, and modernizing immigrants who would either displace or improve the native population (as in Africa).

In British Columbia, Indian activists followed white settler rhetoric in largely ignoring the large indigenous population. In South Africa, Indian immigration was seen as an irritant to South Africa's larger "race problems" of the black population and between Afrikaner and British. In contrast, in popular discourse in British Columbia, the primary "race question" was seen as that of Asian immigration, while the indigenous

---

[139] Brennan, *Taifa*, 6.
[140] "The Indian in Fiji," *IO*, 15 February 1913. Sir Charles Bruce made a parallel argument, stating that the Indian diasporic population stood in relation to the UK the same as the overseas English, Scotch, and Irish populations did. While Bruce's argument did not recognize India's role as an imperial center, he, too, compared the Indian diaspora to a white, imperial diaspora of settlement (Sir Charles Bruce, *Empire Review*, quoted in "Sir Charles Bruce on the Transvaal Crisis," *IO*, 31 October 1908; also quoted in "Sir Charles Bruce on the Transvaal Crisis," *AC*, 14 November 1908; Bruce, *British Indians*, 18-9).
[141] Annexure to the Petition, Annex B, Address of Chairman, 18 November 1902 to Colonial-born Subjects, Natives of India, in the Transvaal, TNA CO 291/61, Transvaal No 14411.
[142] Hofmeyr, "Universalizing," 725.

presence was almost entirely erased from both European and Indian settler discourse. Renisa Mawani has written of the "the contradictory ways in which spectres of indigeneity become the arbiter of racial inclusion and exclusion."[143] The figure of First Nations people appeared in a *Hindi Punch* article in which the Canadian nation appeared as a Native American with a sign saying "Notice: No Indians admitted."[144] Mawani points out the irony that "the indigenous figure is characterized as a symbol of Canada at the very same time that aboriginal peoples along the Pacific Northwest were denied entry into the Canadian polity, remained the targets of racial governance in cities and towns, and were being written out of Canadian history."[145] In white settler and Indian representations, the indigenous Canadian appeared as a national symbol or even mascot, rather than as an actual living presence. Unlike in South Africa, where white settlers saw the black African population as an ever-present, overwhelming numerical threat, Canadian settlers relegated First Nations people to history, writing them out of existence.

This attitude is reflected also in the way in which Indian and white settlers in Canada described their relationship to the land. The Canadian government encouraged European immigrants on the grounds that western Canada needed farmers to cultivate the land.[146] Indian immigrants responded to the government's call for farmers, adopting settler rhetoric of western Canada as an "empty" land waiting for settlers to make it "productive." Passengers on the *Komagata Maru* asked the Canadian government for the grant of a tract of land in Alberta "or any other place where the Benign Government can

[143] Mawani, "Spectres," 16.
[144] Mawani, "Spectres," 11.
[145] Mawani, "Spectres," 12.
[146] Laura Detre, "Canada's Campaign for Immigrants and the Images in *Canada West* Magazine," *Great Plains Quarterly* 24 (Spring 2004): 113-29.

grant a piece of land to cultivate"[147] and promised that "if anyone found not cultivating, Government may deport him."[148] Clearly seeing their immigration in light of sponsored British immigration, Indians in Canada insisted that their willingness to work as farmers should grant them entry to Canada. Rather than an unemployed proletariat waiting to steal white settlers' jobs, as the Canadian public feared, Indian immigrants repeatedly presented themselves as farmers, emphasizing that the Punjab was inhabited largely by agriculturalists and presented a similar topography and climate to Canada.[149] This was in part a legal strategy as well: from May 1910 Canadian immigration law forbid the entrance of laborers, with the exception of farmers, so it was crucial for Indian immigrants to present themselves as farmers.[150] However, the choice of the word "farmer" and "pioneer" to describe Indian immigration was clearly designed to resonate with racist settler colonial ideology on a discursive, not just legal, plane. W. W. Baer's often quoted article argued that Indian immigrants could be useful partners "in our great toil of reducing this Western Province to its most final productive power."[151] *The Hindustanee* described the *Komagata Maru* passengers as "farmers seeking to secure, as

[147] Members of *Komagata Maru* Committee to Governor General (Canada), 8 July 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume601, File 879545, Pt. 3.
[148] telegram, *Komagata Maru* Committee to Governor General (Canada), quoted in letter, RUSH, Reid to Scott, 9 July 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, Pt. 3. See also this telegram in which the passengers stated first that "Our brothers ashore can collect sums to arrange for land" but then stated that "Some blocks of land should be awarded in any part of Canada to cultivate" (night lettergram, *Komagata Maru* passengers to Governor General (Canada), 18 July, 1914, copied in letter, Reid to Scott, 20 July 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, Pt. 4,). This idea was bruited again during the war, with a suggestion that Canada might "show a real spirit of Empire citizenship" by providing a tract of land for Indian soldiers after the war (*Canada and India*, October 1915).
[149] This argument also responded specifically to earlier Canadian arguments that Indian immigrants were not suited to the cold Canadian climate. "British Indians in Canada," *AC*, 24 February 1912; Translation, Gurdit Singh's notice *Wahi Guru Ji Ki Fatteh: Congratulations! Congratulations!! Congratulations!!!*, enclosed in Governor General (Hong Kong) to SSC, 8 April 1914, LAC IB RG76, Volume 601, File 879545, Pt. 1; Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 371; "Sikh Farmers in Canada," *Aryan*, August 1912.
[150] This was a key argument of the Munshi Singh case, alongside the claim that Singh was Aryan not Asiatic (Shah, *Stranger Intimacy*, 218).
[151] Baer, "The Problems of Hindu Immigration in to Canada," *Victoria Times*, 8 July 1911, LAC RG13 A-2, Volume 167, Nos. 923, R188-39-8-E.

British subjects, a little of the millions of fertile acres of British Columbia soil now lying wastefully idle."[152] This statement erased First Nations' usage of the land in favor of a shared British-Indian settler vision of self-sufficient farms as the only mode of productivity.

Rhetoric in defense of South African Indians also focused on productivity, but with different valences. Where anti-Asian rhetoric depicted Indian indentured labor as a threat to South Africa's future as a "white man's country," defenders of Indian immigration proudly emphasized the role that indentured Indians had played in Natal's economic prosperity. In an article pointedly entitled "How Natal Was Saved: From Impending Ruin: By Indians," *African Chronicle* argued that Indian indentured labor was responsible for making Natal agriculturally productive. In a striking challenge to claims that white settlers were particularly capable of making unoccupied land productive, *African Chronicle* argued that "where the European starved, there the Indian will turn a out [sic] beautiful garden and live contented, where the European will barely make his rent, there the Indian thrived and worked up a substantial connection."[153] In this interpretation, Indian labor was responsible for making Natal known as the "Garden Colony" and it was Indian indentured immigration *in particular* that made Natal a successful settlement.[154]

---

[152] *Hindustanee,* June 1914). See also: "waste tracts of land" (K. H. S. Sandho, "'Nonsense Talks about the Komagata Maru': Hindu Passenger Writes to the Province—His Views in his own words," *Province*, 2 July 1914) and "'millions of acres in Canada, awaiting cultivation'" (Sunder Singh, quoted in "Dr. Sundar Singh Pleads His Cause: Do Not Discriminate Against my people," *Montreal Herald*, quoted in *Sansar*, June 1914).

[153] "How Natal Was Saved: From Impending Ruin: By Indians," *AC*, 18 July 1908.

[154] "Self-reliance, not Mendacity," *AC,* 6 December 1908; "Indian Repatriation (2)," *High-Class Hindi Weekly*, 16 June 1922; Indicus, *Labour and Other Questions in South Africa: Being Mainly Considerations on the Rational and Profitable Treatment of the Coloured Races living There* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903), 37-8, 63-4, 69, 139.

Praise for Indian indentured labor was often contrasted with assumptions of black Africans' laziness.[155] *Indian Opinion* wrote that, "One can understand the necessity for registration of Kaffirs who will not work; but why should registration be required for indentured Indians[?]"[156] Indentured workers were particularly praised as the saviors of Natal. Adopting European justification of indenture, elite Indians argued that indentured workers were recruited to South Africa because the African population would not work or would not work as well.[157]

Utilizing the rhetoric of the civilizing mission, South African Indians argued that Indian traders brought culture and economic integration to the Africans. While white settlers argued that Indian traders cheated Africans and introduced them to liquor and other bad habits, defenders of Indian immigration celebrated their role as "pioneers in introducing and extending trade among the aboriginal natives."[158] One petition stated that Indians "entertain a just appreciation of the *aboriginal* races, behave to them considerately, and help to *civilize* them by our intercourse."[159] Where Canadian rhetoric encouraged settlers to ignore native presence, Indians in South Africa responded to white settler fears by highlighting the difference between Indian settlers and indigenous Africans. South African Indian activists praised both indentured immigrants and passenger Indians for their role in transforming the people as well as the land.

---

[155] Gandhi to Colonial Secretary (Pietermaritzburg), 24 March 1896, NAB CSO 1460, 1661/1896; L. T. L. Hullett, *Bombay Gazette*, quoted in "The South African Labour Question," *CIN*, 4 October 1904; Indicus, *Labour Question*, 64; *Times*, quoted in "The Coolie Emigrants: From 'Indian Affairs in 'The Times,'" *IO*, 11 November 1905.
[156] "The Natal Municipal Corporations Bill," *IO*, 18 March 1905.
[157] A. Royeppen, "Correspondence," *IO*, 19 September 1908.
[158] petition from British Indian subjects in Natal to SSC, 10 July 1909, NAB CSO 1875, 4112/1909
[159] Annexure to the Petition, Annex C, Copies of Resolutions of the Special Meeting, 18 November 1902 to Colonial-born Subjects, Natives of India, in the Transvaal, TNA CO 291/61,CO 291/61, Transvaal No 14411. See also: E. H. Sadler, *Journal of the African Society*, "Indians in South Africa: Their Civilising Influence," *IO*, 30 March 1912.

The language of "Garden Colony" in Natal and "farmer" in British Columbia shared underlying assumptions about agricultural productivity and the role of settlers. However, the specific rhetoric of settlement differed depending on the political and demographic contexts in which Indians found themselves operating. In British Columbia, Indian immigrants asserted their right to individual farm property, premised on the unspoken disenfranchisement and extermination of First Nations peoples. In Natal, the image of the Garden Colony relied on indentured labor on commercial plantations, while in both Natal and the Transvaal, Indian traders prided themselves on their role as a necessary go-between "civilizing" the local African population in ways that whites could or would not. The terms "farmer" and "pioneer" did not suit the South African context, despite the emphasis on Indian immigrants' productivity. Farmers, pioneers, or settlers, Indians in Canada and South Africa adapted their rhetoric to fit the dominant colonizers' discourse.

Conclusion

The racialized language in which Indian activists asserted their whiteness varied widely depending on racial geographies they encountered and the communities they represented. Indian activists in South Africa and Canada faced similar restrictive legislation and theorized their struggle as a transnational or global movement.[160] However, immigrants in the two colonies came from different parts of India, with distinct religious, regional, and linguistic backgrounds, and they encountered diverse settler politics and racial geographies in the colonies to which they immigrated. As a result of these differences, Indian activists in the two colonies developed very distinctive racial defenses of their claims to imperial citizenship. An analysis of Indian invocations of

[160] See introduction.

imperial citizenship in this period reveals that the language of whiteness was geographically as well as historically specific. Historians must acclimate to these different registers in order to attend simultaneously to the structural similarities of whiteness across space and the detailed distinctions.

This chapter should *not* be taken as arguing that ethnic demographics determined Indian political rhetoric. On the contrary, terms such as "British," "Asian," "Aryan," "coloured," and "white" were constantly being revised and contested during this period. As European settlers tried to create and enforce a worldwide binary of black/white, such racial categorizations were continually challenged and redefined. Indians in diaspora engaged creatively with the racialized politics that they encountered in different colonies, but their views were also influenced by their experiences coming from different(ly racialized) parts of the British Raj, the class and gender politics of Indian nationalism and imperial citizenship, and the political alliances they built with other "coloured" imperial subjects.

Chapter Four

Politics in Print: Creating a Transnational Political Scene

The preceding chapters have analyzed the political and racial connotations of the discourse of imperial citizenship as it circulated across the British empire. The idea of Indian imperial citizenship did not exist solely at the level of discourse, however. Discourse was produced through processes of production and exchange that intentionally mirrored the arguments being made. This chapter and the following chapter focus on the very material creation and circulation of the print culture out of which the discourse of imperial citizenship emerged.

By putting imperial governance and Indian activism in the same framework, I am able to approach them under the rubric of "politics in print." Editors and readers of diasporic periodicals imagined and enacted imperial citizenship through their use of print culture. This chapter argues that the reproduction of political documents and meetings, from British Parliamentary papers to deportation proceedings and from Natal Indian Congress banquets to political theater in Vancouver, was fundamental to the creation of diasporic Indian politics expressed in and through print culture. The copying of government documents and verbatim reports of local and diasporic political activities served multiple purposes. It provided information about the status of Indian immigrants across the empire. It helped frame Indian immigration and racial discrimination as an imperial problem by reproducing reports from across the empire. And finally, it allowed readers to participate in a widespread political culture, offering them direct access to activist correspondence and political debates in and beyond their immediate vicinity. These practices of reproduction never simply conveyed news. They created a new

political geography premised on the mobility of texts and people, an itinerant empire that was a direct riposte to colonial visions of exclusive white federation.

Blue Books and Court Cases: challenging the government's textual authority

The (re)publication of government documents was fundamental to diasporic editors' creation of an imperial political sphere in which Indians could participate. Although they were banned from voting in most elections, Indians in Canada, South Africa, and elsewhere in the empire saw themselves as imperial citizens. Newspapers, and print culture more broadly, provided a place in which disenfranchised Indians could engage with and participate in imperial political culture. By reprinting government documents, Indian editors were practicing their membership in the empire. Through the reproduction of government documents relevant to Indians, diasporic activists imagined an empire centered on India and Indian affairs.

News items about the publication of government documents were incredibly frequent. For important government documents, editors reported on the production of the document at multiple stages. *African Chronicle*, for example, reported on the imperial government's Commission on Indian Immigration over the course of several months. It announced when the Commission was formed, when members were identified, when hearings began, and when its report was published.[1] Very important documents like the 1914 Indian Relief might be reprinted in full, even if it took several issues to complete the publication.[2] Others might necessitate a special supplement.[3] Some items, such as the

[1] "Indian Immigration Commission," *AC*, 19 December 1908; "Indian Immigration Commission," *AC*, 26 December 1908; "Inquiry Committee," *AC*, 13 March 1909; "Evidence at the Indian Commission," *AC*, 20 March 1909; "The Crown Colonies and Indian Immigration," *AC*, 24 April 1909; "Report of the Indian Immigration Commission," *AC*, 16 October 1909.
[2] "The Transvaal Asiatic Blue Book," *IO*, 7 March 1908; "The Transvaal Asiatic Blue Book (cont'd from last issue)," *IO*, 14 March 1908.
[3] *IO* supplement, 18 March 1911.

Union Gazette discussing the government's policy on Muslim marriages, were worth publishing multiple times.[4] Less relevant or less important documents, like the Durban census, might be announced in a smaller article or even a single sentence with the important information summarized for readers.[5] This type of brief note was rare, however. More commonly, government publications worthy of mention were heralded before their publication and subsequently quoted, excerpted, or paraphrased, frequently followed by editorial commentary.

The types of government documents that were reproduced also varied widely, but the most common were Parliamentary debates, Blue Books, and court cases. The publication of a Blue Book (the governmental publication of relevant letters and memos on a particular topic) on South African or Canadian Indian affairs was regularly announced and the text of said Blue Books were frequently reproduced in whole or in part.[6] The publication of these government documents was important news. In the midst of the passive resistance movement, the Transvaal correspondent for *Indian Opinion* wrote that "Undoubtedly *the most important happening of the week* is the publication of the Blue Book on the negotiations relating to the anti-Indian Ordinance of last year. Both the *Star* and the *Leader* publish copious extracts."[7] In this case, it was not only the publication of a Blue Book on anti-Indian legislation that was important, but also the attention paid to it by two anti-Asiatic Transvaal newspapers. In another issue, *Indian Opinion* informed their readers that a Reuter telegram came from London just as the

[4] "Proclamation: Mahomedan Marriage," *AC*, 18 April 1914.
[5] "General Notes and News," *AC*, 3 April 1909.
[6] "Rules relating to the admission of Sworn Translations," *AC*, 13 April 1912; "Indian Immigration Amendment Bill," *AC*, 5 February 1910; "Judicial Commission," *AC*, 20 December 1913; "The Blue-Book: On the Transvaal Situation," *IO*, 1 May 1909; "United States Immigration Commission Recommend Exclusion of Hindu," *Aryan*, June 1912.
[7] "Johannesburg Jotting: From Our Transvaal Representative," *IO*, 16 March 1907, italics added.

paper was going to press with news that "A lengthy and important Blue-book was issued this evening with regard to the Asiatic legislation in the Transvaal."[8] Despite not having access to the text of this document, *Indian Opinion* still felt that even rumors that a Blue Book was *going* to be published were worth reporting.[9]

Publications might also be described, with the size and weight providing evidence of the importance of the issue. The *Hindustanee* apologized to its readers that a relevant *Hansard* debate was 34 pages and, due to space and time, they could only publish excerpts.[10] The *Indian Opinion* described a Blue Book as "bulky volume containing 88 pages, foolscap size." Unfortunately, while the volume's length indicated the issue's importance, the content of the document "betrays also great want of…knowledge on the part of Lord Elgin."[11] Oz Frankel argues that Blue Books' "sheer size and impenetrability could perhaps signify state power, but also symbolized a loss of control, a failure of the state's digestive system."[12] For *Indian Opinion*, the ignorance demonstrated by government officials in the text of the Blue Books stood in marked contrast to the amount of paper, ink, time, and energy expended by the government on the production and publication of this correspondence.

Diasporic periodicals eagerly reported any Parliamentary questions as evidence of British support for their position.[13] The BCINC's official newspaper *India* ran a weekly

[8] Reuter (London, February 14), quoted in "Lord Selborne and the Asiatic Ordinance," *IO*, 16 February 1907.
[9] "News in Brief," *AC*, 24 October 1908; "A Case for a Commission," *IO*, 23 February 1907.
[10] *Hansard* of 2 March 1914 quoted in "Mr. H. H. Stevens, M. P., Imposes His Ignorance on the Federal House on the Hindu Question: Backbites Bai [sic] Bhagwan Singh, Heaps Base Slanders on Hindustanees," *Hindustanee* April 1914.
[11] "The Transvaal Asiatic Blue Book," *IO*, 7 March 1908. See also: Reuter (London 20 October), quoted in "Asiatic Blue Book," *IO*, 24 October 1908.
[12] Frankel, "Blue Books," 309.
[13] "Hindu Question in the British Parliament," *Aryan*, January 1912; "B. C. Hindus and the British Parliament," *Aryan*, July 1912; "News and Notes," *Aryan*, August 1912.

column entitled "Imperial Parliament" which reprinted any recent Parliamentary debates on India. In addition to providing information on the important politics of the day, this column, which was "Specially Reported for 'India'" emphasized the imperial nature of the British parliament and specifically its engagement with India. The regular recurrence of this feature addressed nationalist complaints that Parliament didn't spend enough time or expertise on India. The BCINC used *India* to pressure British politicians to discuss Indian affairs in an educated manner and to become advocates for Indians. At the same time, by only reporting on Indian debates in Parliament, this column imagined a centrality to Indian affairs that was not necessarily reflected in Parliamentary reality. In "The Imperial Parliament" column, the British empire became a polity in which Indian policies were debated in London and subsequently circulated in print throughout the empire. Excerpts from this column were in turn reproduced by smaller periodicals. Diasporic journals also included parliamentary debates from colonial or municipal legislative assemblies.

Editors obtained these documents in several different ways. The imperial government often sent material to friendly editors, although diasporic Indian printers were not always deemed worthy of these receipts.[14] In 1901, Natal provided Aiyar with copies of the Government Gazette but in 1908, his request for a similar service for *African Chronicle* was denied.[15] Other times, editors relied on readers to provide copies. Editors' position as political leaders gave them access to more materials, allowing them to publish organizations' political literature as well as government publications. For

[14] Barrier, *Banned*, 7.
[15] NAB CSO Volume 1689 9568/1901; "Acknowledgement," *CIN*, 15 November 1901; Minutes Paper NAB CSO 1858/1908 3832/1908. See also: P. S. Aiyar to Colonial Secretary (Pietermaritzburg), 23 May 1901, NAB CSO Volume 1677 4247/1901; Principal Undersecretary to Aiyar, 3 June 1901, NAB CSO Volume 1677 4247/1901; H. J. Stanley to L. W. Ritch, 27 November1913, SAB GG Volume 897, 15/535.

example, petitions sometimes included copies of the law to which they were objecting, and in reproducing these petitions, editors also provided the text of the laws in question. One reader sent *Indian Opinion* a copy of his letter to SABIC, which contained a copy of petition from Indians in Nyasaland Protectorate objecting to laws that barred Indians from carrying firearms and a copy of the Nyasaland Government Gazette containing the offensive law.[16] A TBIA petition contained an appendix with two green books, two blue books, and a copy of the relevant laws and resolutions of the Volksraad. In addition to these government documents being quoted within the petition, the entire petition, including appendices, was reproduced in an *Indian Opinion* article.[17] The reprinting of activist correspondence and petitions in Blue Books and other government publications in turn created an imperial print culture in which legislation, correspondence, and activist protests were thoroughly and repeatedly imbricated with each other. The line between private and public, official and activist, print cultures was as easily and often crossed as were geographical divisions between different locations in the empire.

The quotation and paraphrasing of government documents should not be interpreted as meek assent to or mimetic regurgitation of official policy, however. Frankel argues that Victorian activists in Britain often used quotations from Blue Books to strengthen their opposition to the government policy. Statistics and quotations directly from the Blue Books lent credence to activists' assertions as these "appropriations thus made shrewd use of the authority of the state."[18] Indian activists likewise used Blue Books as the ground from which to launch their investigations. In the first issue of

[16] "In British Central Africa: Indians to be Prevented from Using Firearms," *AC*, 20 February 1909.
[17] "British Indian Association and Constitution Committee: Exhaustive Statements: British Promises," *IO*, 2 June 1906. See also: "The London All-India Moslem League Representation: On the British Indian Question in South Africa," *IO*, 24 December 1910.
[18] Frankel, "Blue Books," 310.

Colonial Indian News, Aiyar argued that newspapers were responsible for "the suppression of misrule, violence and personal government of despotic rulers…The wenspaper [sic]…compell [sic] even a reluctant ruler to respect the wishes of his subjects and is thus instrumental in ameliorating the conditions of the massee [sic]."[19] Editors routinely encouraged their audience to read governments documents for themselves in order to form their own opinion. After announcing the publication of a Union Gazette stating that a Public Judicial Inquiry would be held into the 1913 strike, *African Chronicle* assured its readers: "As the full text of the proclamation of this commission is before us, our readers will be better able to judge the importance of this commission."[20] The reproduction of government publications allowed readers and editors to hold the state accountable for its words.

Editors took their role as government watchdog very seriously. They scrutinized government publications and officials' statements for inaccuracies, slurs, contradictions, or retractions. *Indian Opinion* opined that "It has been said that speech was invented to disguise thought. There can be no doubt but that Blue-books were designed to conceal the truth."[21] Specifically, *Indian Opinion* blamed the Transvaal government for forwarding "such facts, or such statements of misstatements of facts" to the imperial government, with the result that the Blue Book "teem[ed] with errors of omission and commission."[22] Another article put the blame more squarely on imperial officials who determined the contents of the material published in Blue Books. This article observed of a recent Blue Book, "As usual, it is chiefly remarkable for what it does not contain. Several important

[19] "The Newspaper Press," *CIN*, 18 May 1901.
[20] "From the Editor's Chair: Indian Judicial Commission," *AC*, 20 December 1913.
[21] "The Blue Book," *IO*, 21 November 1908
[22] Ibid.

documents to which reference is made are not printed."[23] In contrast to the imperial government's omissions, *Indian Opinion* emphasized that "We publish the most important documents contained in the Blue-Book. They will form a useful addition for the literature of the subject, for those who are interested in a study of the arts of evasion and misrepresentation."[24] Government publications were reproduced as much to expose official ignorance and perfidy as to provide information on legal and political developments.

Activists also scrutinized government publications for evidence of colonial officials' ignorance, prejudice, or incapacity for political leadership. *Indian Opinion* excoriated Smuts for stating that Transvaal Indians had always been required to give their mothers' names on registration documents. In an article sarcastically titled "Mr. Smuts' Facts," *Indian Opinion* indignantly asked, "what is one to think of the chief spokesman of a Government who actually is ignorant of the history of the country that he is ruling…Has Mr. Smuts read nothing of the vast mass of literature on the subject? Does he not know anything whatever of the contents of Green Books and Blue Books relating to Law 3 of 1885?"[25] Contrasting Smuts' ignorance with "Indian experts," *Indian Opinion* presented Smuts as an uneducated illiterate incapable of running a government. A few months later, *African Chronicle* exposed the inaccuracy of the Transvaal government's claims that "the country was being overrun by illicit entry of Asiatics."[26] Although "this information was taken for gospel truth" and used to justify the Asiatic Registration Act, time proved that "of the 9000 so-called illicit entries, 7600 have already

[23] "The Latest Blue-Book," *IO*, 1 May 1909
[24] Ibid.
[25] "Mr. Smuts' Facts," *IO*, 18 January 1908.
[26] "Mr. Essop Mia's Speech," *AC*, 4 July 1908.

proved their Bona-fides."[27] *African Chronicle* contrasted these truthful numbers with the inaccuracy of Mr. Duncan, the government statistician who was charged with finding reasons "both imaginary and real" to pass the anti-Asian legislation.[28] *African Chronicle* called into question both the Transvaal government's skill and morals. Another article lamented, "No lover of the British Empire can read without shame and sorrow the blue book issued by Lord Elgin on the Transvaal British Indian question…The pages of this publication shows that the might of the Empire is now to be used, unlike as in the days of yore, not for redressing wrongs, but for aggravating them."[29] Imperial publications were interpreted as demonstrating that imperial officials were not true "lover[s] of the British empire" and that the empire itself was being perverted from within. The republication of imperial documents was as much about monitoring imperial and colonial governments as it was about evoking imperial authority.

Editors presented themselves as intermediaries between their readers and the government, and their explication of government documents often extended to guiding their readers' engagement with government texts. Announcements in diasporic papers publicized government policy to those who might otherwise not be aware of recent changes. For instance, during its long-standing battle against the £3 tax on ex-indentured Indians, the *African Chronicle* reported on a circular by the Minister of Finance instructing Magistrates not to imprison indigent Indians who could not pay their tax.[30] At a time when many Indians were re-indenturing in order to avoid paying the tax, this internal government memo was made available to the largely Tamil-speaking, poorly

[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] "The Blue Book," *IO*, 29 February 1908.
[30] "Who are the Indigent People," *AC*, 4 March 1911. See also: Santani [pseud.], "Stray Notes," *AC*, 12 December 1908.

educated indentured Indian community through the *African Chronicle*. On another occasion, *African Chronicle* harshly criticized both *Indian Opinion* and the South African government for printing circulars about the £3 tax that mistranslated the law.[31] Sometimes newspapers combined informational announcements with demands for further reform. In an article reporting that the fee for ID certificate was reduced from £1 for twelve months to 2 shillings 6 pence for three years, *Indian Views* opined that the non-refundable £1 fee for a temporary permit should also be reduced.[32] Publicizing these government documents was a form of political advocacy.

Other commentaries served to interpret obscure legal language for a broader readership. For instance, a correspondent to the *Natal Mercury* wrote under the pseudonym "Humanity" that the post office savings bank required Indians to have their checks witnessed by a Justice of the Peace and that many uneducated Indians didn't know what a JP was and went looking for someone with those initials.[33] In another case, G. Parameswaran Pillai noted that with the annexation of the Transvaal by the British, the 1894 Act barring Indians from the franchise had been disallowed, but that the new voting act did not mention Indians specifically at all, leaving the question of their rights open.[34] When documents were unclear, editors either published their questions or wrote to government officials asking for clarification.[35]

---

[31] "The Deluded Indian," *AC*, 9 September 1911; "Comedy of Errors," *AC*, 16 September 1911; "Asiatic Licenses: Position under the Statute," *AC*, 11 November 1911.
[32] "Certificates of Identification," *IV*, 31 July 1914.
[33] Humanity [pseud.], *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "More Red Tape: The Way Poor Indians are Treated by the Post Office," *AC*, 2 July 1910.
[34] G. Parameswaran Pillai, *The Indian Politics*, quoted in "The Status of British Indians Abroad," *CIN*, 19 July 1901.
[35] "The Transvaal Government and British Indian Subjects," *CIN*, 30 August 1902; "British Indians in the Transvaal: Colonial Secretary's Reply," *CIN*, 20 September 1902; "Identification Certificates," *IV*, 28 August 1914;

Advice could also take the form of explaining legal terminology. *Aryan* even advertised for "A capable Hindu lawyer knowing Hindustani," either to do legal work for the paper or to offer pro-bono services to the Indian community. The advertisement promised "Great prospects for a man having ambitions to help his countrymen and improve himself" and advised readers to "Apply care [of] the Editor of this paper."[36] *African Chronicle* arranged something similar

> "with one who is capable of conducting this column, which would appear at least once a month, for the purpose of helping many of our readers, by trying to solve their difficulties on knotty educational points of a general character, which would be of public importance. There would be fee charged and our readers are at liberty to write to 'Tilak,' c/o this office on any of their doubts which the conducter [sic] of our 'Inquiry Column' shall endeavour to clear."[37]

At other times, editors directly offered legal advice to an individual, as when *Indian Views* published its response to N. J. Shaik of Danhauser, informing him that he could not compel the Immigration Department to replace the Certificate of Domicile which he lost. However, since he entered Transvaal as an educated person "we do not think you will have any difficulty in re-entering Natal."[38] Although this was directed at one particular individual, the subtitle of the article, "A Significant Query," indicated that the editor believed it would be relevant to many readers.

Other times it was not editors but readers who responded to each other's queries. After reading an article in *Indian Opinion* about immigration of Indians to British Central Africa, B. Somer wrote to the paper asking "if a passport is necessary, where I can obtain

[36] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, May 1912.
[37] "Our Inquiry Column on Matters Educational," *AC*, 3 September 1910.
[38] "A Singular Incident: A Significant Query," *IV*, 17 July 1914. See also: "Correspondence: Answers to Correspondents," *IO*, 23 June 1906.

one[?]"[39] *Indian Opinion* published his letter but offered no reply. Instead, "One of Your Readers" wrote that a passport must be obtained from British Vice-Consul or His Majesty's Commissioner and that immigrants were required to demonstrate that they had enough money to go back home if they did not find employment.[40] The delay of two months between query and response demonstrates the length of time it took for newspapers and letters to circulate. But it also indicates the presence of active members of a diasporic community—beyond activist leaders and editors—who were interested in furthering each other's goals.

Editors informed readers of their rights and responsibilities, educating readers about how to fulfill their civic responsibility. This included instructions on paying increased taxes or using new forms to apply for re-entry to the Transvaal after the Anglo-Boer War.[41] Prior to the 1911 census, *African Chronicle* informed its readers that they must answer the census accurately and that if they did not have a home or would be travelling on 7 May they must go to a magistrate's office to fill out a form.[42] After Gandhi's initial compromise with Smuts over the question of Indian registration in the Transvaal, both *Indian Opinion* and *African Chronicle* informed readers how to register voluntarily, where they could register, and when the deadline for doing so was.[43] In some instance, editors even offered to be the go-between, encouraging readers to register for necessary government documents with their offices rather than directly with the government.

---

[39] B. Somer, "Correspondence: British Central Africa," *IO*, 9 June 1906.
[40] One of your Readers [pseud.], "Correspondence: British Central Africa," *IO*, 11 August 1906.
[41] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "For Permits to Return," *CIN*, 25 October 1901; "Notice to the Transvaal Refugees," *CIN*, 20 December 1901; Santani [pseud.], "Stray Notes," *AC*, 12 December 1908.
[42] "Census of 1911," *AC*, 15 April 1911.
[43] "End of the Transvaal Struggle," *AC*, 27 May 1911; *Indian Opinion* quoted in "To Transvaal Indians," *AC*, 23 September 1911.

Editor-printers like Gandhi, Aiyar, and Singh proffered their services to the government, offering to translate and print government notices in Indian languages. The Natal government asked *Indian Opinion* to publish an announcement in Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, and English about a change in the marriage policy for immigration law. *Indian Opinion* replied that it no longer printed its newspaper in Tamil and Hindi, but that it could distribute notices at the cost of £5.5.0 each for translation and printing in Hindi and Tamil and £2.2.0 for printing in English. Reflecting the lack of competent Hindi and Tamil translators at Phoenix, Albert West, *Indian Opinion*'s editor at the time, wrote, "If you like to send your own translations, so much the better." Natal ultimately sent the documents to Madras for Tamil and Telugu translation and to Calcutta for Hindi.[44]

At other times, governments were much more circumspect about using Indian printers as a resource. When Aiyar asked if he could translate the Natal Government *Gazette* into Tamil for *Colonial Indian News*, the Attorney General decided that there was no objection "provided that he [Aiyar] in no way represents the translation as having any Government authority."[45] In Canada, government officials argued that local Indians could not be trusted with translation jobs because they would gossip or lie. Instead, they recommended sending to India or England for translations.[46] Immigration agent Malcolm

[44] NAB, Indian Immigration Paper 1/150 I 468/07.
[45] Aiyar to Colonial Secretary (Pietermaritzburg), 5 November 1901, NAB CSO Volume 1689, 9568/1901; Memo, 8 November 1901, NAB CSO Volume 1689, 9568/1901; Memo from Attorney General to Colonial Secretary, 7 November 1901, NAB CSO Volume 1689, 9568/1901.
[46] W. C. Hopkinson to W. W. Cory, 4 July 1912, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 5; William Clowes and Sons (Ltd) to Cory, 29 September 1912, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 5; Malcolm Reid to W. D. Scott, 30 October 1913, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999, Pt. 8; Reid to Scott, 19 November 1913, LAC IB RG76, Volume 387, File 536999, R.O., part 1; Scott to W. L. Griffith, 24 November1913, LAC IB RG76, Volume 384, File 536999,, Pt. 8; copy, Expenditures in Canada, 19 July 1916, LAC Borden Papers, OC 196 (2)-OC 196 (6)MG26, H 1(a), Volume 41.

Reid told his superior that Sunder Singh should not be used as a translator for immigration cases because Singh was an agitator.[47]

Serving as translators and printers of government documents served both practical and idealistic purposes. On the one hand, applications to translate government documents reflect the monetary reality of being a jobbing printer always short of cash. When Aiyar declared bankruptcy after *Colonial Indian News* failed, he applied for a job as a Tamil interpreter and translator for the Durban and Pietermaritzburg governments and courts.[48] However, such offers also indicated editors' dedication to creating an imperial print culture by serving as intermediaries between governmental print culture and non-official Indian print culture.

Addresses, petitions, and the politics of loyalty

These addresses and petitions highlighted the diasporic and imperial dimensions of Indian activism. Using their status as British subjects, diasporic Indians appealed to a wide range of colonial and imperial officials, from local immigration officers to Viceroys and from colonial Governor-Generals to British monarchs, for redress. One petition from Indians in Canada emphasized the Governor-General's multiple statuses within Britain and the empire, as a member of the royal family, an English aristocrat, and a colonial official. The petition began

> "TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS PRINCE ARTHUR WILLIAM PATRICK ALBERT, DUKE OF CONNAUGHT AND OF STRATHEARN, EARL OF SUSSEX, PRINCE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, DUKE OF SAXONY, &C., GOVERNOR

[47] Reid to G.L. Milne, 24 September 1913, LAC Immigration Branch , RG76, Volume384, File 536999, Pt. 6, Microfilm C-10280.
[48] Aiyar to Minister of Justice (Pietermaritzburg), 23 August 1904, NAB CSO 1769, 7668/1904; Aiyar to Colonial Secretary, 23 August 1904, NAB CSO 1769, 7622/1904.

GENERAL AND COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF OUR DOMINION OF CANADA."[49]

Often petitions were addressed to several different officials. In doing this, activists ensured that their complaints were seen by officials across a wide geographical range and political scale of importance. For example, Indian refugees seeking permits to return to the Transvaal applied first to the Uitlander Committee who referred them to Lord Kitchener and the High Commissioner. Upon receiving no reply after several months, Aiyar advised his readers that a memorial should be address to Lord Alfred Milner where "it cannot fail to secure Justice and sympathy."[50] What Aiyar advised in South Africa, Husain Rahim and Baboo Singh put into action in Vancouver. Having sent a petition in April 1910 to the Canadian government to which they received no reply, they re-submitted the petition a year later, addressing it this time to the Secretary of State for India as well as to the Governor-General of Canada.[51] Indian activists emphasized the transnational and imperial aspect of their diasporic existence, positioning themselves as subject-citizens of multiple governments simultaneously. This technique used Indian diasporans' liminal status to their advantage, ensuring that if one official did not attend to their request, it would be seen by other officials as well.

[49] Petition quoted in telegram from Rajah Singh and Kartar Singh to Governor General (Canada), 14 November 1913, LAC IB RG76, Vol 384, File 536999, Pt. 8. Capitalization in the original.
[50] "Return of Refuges," *CIN*, 18 October 1901.
[51] Vancouver Indians' petition (H. Rahim and Baboo Singh) to Secretary of State for India [henceforth SSI], n.d., BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568. Newspaper reports state that this second petition was sent to the Canadian Government, Viceroy, Secretary of State for the Colonies, Secretary of State for India, and to prominent Indian leaders in the subcontinent including Sir Pertab Singh, Gokhale, Shade Lal Ahluwalia, and Sir Mian Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana, and to the Indian press ("Local Hindus Appeal to State Secretary: Ask Their Right of British Citizenship Be Recognized in Canada: Petition Sent to Earl of Crewe," *Daily News Advertiser*, 25 April 1911, enclosed in Hopkinson to Cory, 26 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568).

At the same time, activists had to be careful not to offend colonial or local officials by appealing to imperial superiors.[52] Canadian Indian activists explained in their 1911 petition to the Secretary of State for India that "Whereas our previous petitions to the Canadian Government did not succeed in securing any assurance of any kind, and as our rights of British citizenship were completely ignored we are appealing to the Imperial authorities although we mean no discourtesy to the Canadian Government."[53] This strategy allowed activists to appeal to the imperial government for protection of their rights as "British citizens" while still protecting their Canadian rights by insisting that they were not intentionally circumventing the Canadian government's authority.

While petitions put Indians in the position of pleading for their rights as imperial citizens, addresses could also be to demonstrate Indians' willingness to take on the duties of citizenship. Leading Indian activists in South Africa were scrupulous in issuing addresses of birthday wishes, condolences, congratulations, welcome, and gratitude to monarchs, ministers, governors, and other colonial and imperial officials. No expense was spared on these documents. In the first year of the passive resistance movement, the NIC spent £10 cabling birthday wishes to King Edward VII.[54] In 1908, *Indian Opinion* noted that Volksrust Indians' "handsome illuminated address" to Botha marked "the first time, under the new *régime*, that Indians have testified in this manner to their respect for

[52] In a fraught instance of inter-imperial loyalties, Gandhi wrote to the Colonial Secretary on behalf of South African Indian Muslims explaining that they had sent their congratulations to His Majesty the Sultan on the 25th anniversary of his ascendance to the throne. They wrote that they had sent this address through the Turkish ambassador in London. However, they wished to know for future reference if it was more appropriate for the address to be sent through the Colonial Office (Gandhi to Colonial Secretary, 14 August 1900, NAB CSO 1654, 6061/1900). Apparently the Colonial Secretary didn't care much, since an earlier letter had gone unanswered (Gandhi to Colonial Secretary, 31 July 1900, NAB CSO 1654, 6061/1900).
[53] Vancouver Indians' petition (H. Rahim and Baboo Singh) to SSI, n.d., BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; "Local Hindus Appeal to State Secretary: Ask Their Right of British Citizenship Be Recognized in Canada: Petition Sent to Earl of Crewe," *Daily News Advertiser* April 25, 1911, enclosed in Hopkinson to Cory, 26 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568.
[54] NAB CSO VOLUME1863, 6269/1908.

members of the Executive in the Transvaal."[55] Now that the Tranvsaal was officially part of the British empire, this address joined a long tradition of Indian demonstrations of loyalty to imperial officials. Indian activists regularly submitted drafts of addresses to local government officials for approval before producing the final copies. Government officials often were so dilatory in their responses that activists had to write two or three times asking for approval before the artist ran out of time to engrave the address or before the celebration had passed.[56] These addresses were intended as evidence, not only of the Indian community's goodwill towards British and colonial officials but also as evidence of their education, wealth, and other qualifications for citizenship.

The refusal to participate in the ceremonial aspects of these addresses and presentations could be used to mark political protests. In 1910, when the Duke of Connaught visited South Africa, *Indian Opinion* reported that Transvaal Indians had an address engraved but they merely forwarded it and they refused to participate in or attend celebrations for His Royal Highness, in protest at the situation of Indians in South Africa. *Indian Opinion* offered no description of the address, in contrast to the usual practice of providing detailed images of these documents for readers to appreciate.[57] On the same occasion, the British Indian Association and the Natal Indian Congress wrote letters reaffirming their loyalty to the throne but stated that they could not greet the Duke in

[55] "General Botha at Volksrust: Indian Address of Welcome," *IO*, 14 March 1908.
[56] Natal Indian Congress to Colonial Secretary (Pietermaritzburg), 5 May 1902, NAB CSO 1703, 3405/1902; telegram, NIC to Colonial Secretary, n.d., NAB CSO 1703, 3405/1902; Gandhi to Colonial Secretary, 31 July 1900, NAB CSO 1654, 6061/1900; Gandhi to Colonial Secretary, 14 August 1900, NAB CSO 1654, 6061/1900.
[57] See chapter five for a discussion of the physical appearance of these addresses. "The Duke's Arrival: Dignified Attitude of Indians and Coloured People: From Our Own Correspondent," *IO*, 12 November 1910. The Indian, Malay, and Cape-Coloured Associations also produced addresses but refused to participate in the whites-only celebrations in protest. A similar snub appeared in the BIA's decision that Polak did not represent the Indian community and that they would only present him with an address as a farewell present but with no further celebrations or presentations ("Indian Meeting: Natal Indian Association Climbs Down: Secretary's Confession," *IV*, 29 September 1916).

person and that Indians' loyalty to the empire was strained by South African racial policy.[58] An editorial in *Indian Opinion* pointed out that this marked a significant break with earlier monarchical visits, when hundreds of pounds were spent on arches, addresses, and decorations.[59] The production and presentation of these addresses exemplified Indian immigrants' willingness to participate in literate demonstrations of their loyalty to the empire, and any deviation from these practices was a pointed protest.

What he said: (Re)producing a vocabulary of imperial citizenship

After the documents were created, editors further disseminated their impact by describing them in great detail and by reproducing their text, often in full. The content of petitions and addresses was reproduced in newspapers not once but multiple times, increasing the number of people who saw such documents and ensuring that the language used therein was imprinted on readers' brains. Specific case studies (not just famous cases like that of Bhag and Balwant Singh or the *Komagata Maru* passengers but less well-known deportations like that of Mr. Jinjaradasa) were referenced repeatedly. Even more importantly, specific language surrounding questions of Indian immigrants' right to entry on the grounds of class, education, race, and respectability were circulated and re-circulated within this diasporic print culture. Sharing language—by which I mean specific vocabulary, stories, and rhetoric, as well as direct quotations of as much as several paragraphs—within political organizations and amongst collaborators was common, saving time and energy amongst a small group of activists.

---

[58] "Indians and the Royal Visit: No Addresses Presented. Loyal Greetings and Welcome," *IO*, 3 December 1910. The Secretary to the Duke of Connaught refused to give him the NIC's address because of "the contentious matter [it] contained" ("A Polite Refusal: Congress Address to the Duke," *IO*, 10 December 1910). British India League of Capetown submitted a draft of their address of welcome to the Governor-General for approval (British Indian League, Capetown, to Governor General (South Africa), 10 October 1910, SAB GG LEER Volume 885, 15/1/1910.

[59] "From the Editor's Chair: The Royal Visit," *IO*, 3 December 1910.

Particularly in the case of Canada, where there were fewer political activists and fewer lasting periodicals, important quotations and articles would be reproduced ad nauseam, creating the effect of a monovocal political culture amongst English-language activists, whether radical or moderate Indians or white Canadians. There was significant cross-over particularly between Sunder Singh and various white Christian activists, including the Reverend L. W. Hall (secretary of the Victoria Hindu Friends Society), Isabella Ross Broad, Elizabeth Ross Grace (Saskatchewan), and Anna Ross (California).[60] Singh's 1917 article, for example, filled four pages with quotations from Anna Ross and Elizabeth Grace.[61] Language objecting to the deportation of "sober, industrious, law-abiding" and educated Indian subjects in the April 1911 petition of the Hindu Friend Society was repeated a month later in their pamphlet *Summary of the Hindu Question and its results in British Columbia*.[62] Several paragraphs objecting to the favoring of other Asian nations above British subjects and protesting the deportation of wives and children was reproduced verbatim in multiple documents between 1911 and 1917.[63] Some of these make sense, such as Singh's repetition of these paragraphs in his role on the deputation as well as editor of the *Aryan* and author of a 1917 article in the *Journal of Race Development.* He may also have been the anonymous "Hindu-Canadian"

[60] Hall and Singh were founding members of the Canada-India Committee which aimed at cross-cultural reconciliation and understanding.
[61] Anna Ross, quoted in Sunder Singh, "The Hindu in Canada," *The Journal of Race Development* 7, no. 3 (January 1917), 373-4; Elizabeth Ross Grace, quoted in Singh, "Hindu in Canada," 376-7. See also: Sunder Singh, quoted in Broad, *Appeal*; Isabella Ross Broad, *Daily Colonist*, quoted in *A Call for Canadian Justice* (Canada India Committee Leaflet No 2, Toronto, 1915).
[62] petition from Hindu Friend Society of Victoria to Secretary of State for Colonies, 28 April 1911, BL/IOR/L/PJ/6/1064, File 568; S. S. and L. W. H. [Sunder Singh and Reverend L. W. Hall], *Summary of the Hindu Question and its results in British Columbia presented by the Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu to the Empire as a Whole* (Victoria, Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu: May 1911). The petition was reprinted by Sunder Singh in "The Hindu Petition," *Aryan*, August 1911.
[63] deputation (Prof. Teja Singh, Rev. L. W. Hall, Raja Singh and Dr. Sunder Singh) to Ottawa, quoted in "The Hindu Deputation to the Dominion Government," *Aryan*, December 1911; United India League and Khalsa Diwan to Ottawa Government, 15 December 1911, Proof 5277 Published India Office papers, LAC IB RG76, Volume384, File 536999, Pt. 9, Microfilm C-10280; Sunder Singh, "The Hindu in Canada."

who authored the 1915 pamphlet which used these phrases. Others, such as the more radical United India League and Khalsa Diwan's use of the exact same language to the Canadian government, are more surprising. The deputations were made a month apart, and given the expense involved in travelling to Ottawa, this immediate repetition suggests a lack of coordination. Moreover, Singh was persona non grata with the UIL and Khalsa Diwan's leaders. Nonetheless, they must have shared resources at some point. Regardless of how this duplication of language happened, its effect was to reinforce certain phrases and arguments within the collective consciousness.

Textual mobility, technology, and imperial space

The reproduction of information about Indians in diaspora was about more than simply relaying news. By circulating information on Indian immigrants from throughout the empire, diasporic periodicals demonstrated, rather than simply stated, that immigration restriction was an imperial problem. The mobility of pamphlets, periodicals, and telegrams challenged restrictions on Indian people's mobility in material as well as discursive ways.[64] Telegrams were a key technology in both imperial governance and independent activism and were often reproduced in diasporic periodicals. Telegrams that were reprinted in periodicals ranged from mainstream Reuters' items, petitions to imperial officials, or special reports from reporter-activists in the field. Editors used telegrams to get information to their readers as quickly as possible, so that political responses could be developed by the time policies were officially announced. These

[64] For scholarship on Indian press surveillance and nationalist opposition to this censorship, see: Robert Darnton, "Literary Surveillance in the British Raj: The Contradictions of Liberal Imperialism," *Book History* 4 (2001): 133-76; Norman G. Barrier, "The Literature of Confrontation: An Introduction to Banned Publications in British Punjab," *Indian Archives* 21, no. 1 (1972): 9-32; Barrier, *Banned*; U. Kalpagam, "Colonial Governmentality and the Public Sphere in India," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 15, no. 1 (March 2002), 35-58.

periodicals produced a chronology and geography of diasporic activism that particularly emphasized the imperial spaces within which Indians moved, as a way of documenting their imperial citizenship.

In order to get the most up-to-date information, diasporic editors relied on resources from larger commercial papers and new agencies like Reuters. Because of budget constraints, editors most likely poached Reuters' reports from larger newspapers in the area rather than paying for a subscription themselves.[65] This makes sense in a world in which imperial politicians had vast resources for communication technology available to them. *Indian Opinion* reported that the India Office budget for 1903-1904 showed that out of a total expenditure of £190,722, £5,000 was budgeted for telegrams and £500 on the postage of dispatches to India, in addition to £500 more than the previous year spent on stationery, printing and bookbinding.[66] Meanwhile activist-editors struggled to manage on the income from newspaper subscriptions of a few shillings per year.[67] Historians of what Deep Choudhury has called "telegraphic imperialism" have argued that telegraphic communication, and particularly Reuters' reports, were integral to the imperial project.[68] Far from being an equalizing technology, access to telegraphs was dictated by capital and political power.[69] Using white settler newspapers' Reuter's subscriptions and correspondent telegrams from larger papers like the *Rand Daily Mail*, *The Times*, or *The Times of India* was one way to level the playing field.

---

[65] Thanks to James Brennan for pointing this out to me. See also: Milton Israel, *Communications and Power: Propaganda and Press in the Indian nationalist struggle, 1920-1947* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 138.
[66] *Madras Mail*, quoted in "The Wheels of the India Office," *IO*, 12 November 1903.
[67] See chapter one.
[68] Choudhury, *Telegraphic Imperialism*; Codell, "Introduction," 22; Kaul, *Reporting the Raj*; Potter, *News*.
[69] Choudhury, *Telegraphic Imperialism*; Nalbach, "Software"; Kaul, *Reporting the Raj*, 37, 39, 46; Potter, *News*, 29-30.

In this way, diasporic editors could keep their readers informed about activities in Britain, India and elsewhere across the empire, even when this information came at the cost of accuracy. For instance, in order to give its readers the very earliest information on a Parliamentary Paper on the Transvaal Indians, *Indian Opinion* copied a telegram summary by a Rand Daily Mail correspondent. *Indian Opinion* acknowledged that "it is very difficult to comment upon State documents when we have before us only a very imperfect summary, but as it may be some time before the paper itself arrives in South Africa, and as the questions dealt with by it is of very great importance, on the presumption that the telegram is a fair summary of the document in question, we propose to offer a few remarks thereon."[70] Announcing immediate news was deemed more important than accuracy or depth of reporting. Diasporic editors' reliance on larger commercial papers and news agencies, who were often less concerned with Indian affairs, meant that this information was often incomplete or inaccurate.[71] *Indian Opinion* noted that the 1906 telegraphic summary of the annual INC meeting was "meager in the extreme. It is not even a Reuter's messages, which, having in the journalistic world the precedence of all other News Agencies, has the honour of being accepted first by every newspaper in the United Kingdom" but was instead a *Central News* cable.[72] As a result, *Indian Opinion* did not publish more news of the INC until 17 February that year. Editors' dependence on minimal resources had its costs, often delaying or limiting the information they were able to purvey to their readers. However, they developed creative ways of supplementing and expanding their resources.

[70] "More Light on the Indian Question," *IO*, 27 August 1903.
[71] Kaul, *Reporting the Raj*, 39.
[72] "Our Special Correspondent," *IO*, 29 December 1905, "Our Weekly London Letter," *IO*, 27 January 1906.

Activists and editors used personal telegrams and correspondence to keep readers up to date on political developments. In *Indian Opinion*, the distinction between letter and telegram is particularly important. Gandhi valorized one form of communication (the letter) as more deliberate and thoughtful. Hofmeyr argues that *Indian Opinion* used letter exchanges to challenge "the insistent tempo of telegraph-drive and dateline-dominated reporting."[73] Columns such as "Our London Letter," published on a weekly and then monthly basis, created multiple perspectives of time: the reader was both at the event and knowing that a week or more emerged between the event and his or her reading about it.[74] The letter's date, appearing at the beginning of each article, encouraged the reader to take an imaginative trip, following the letter's long passage by steamship or train. It allowed readers to reflect on the imperial, diasporic, and oceanic routes along which the letter had traveled and with which readers were now engaging. This invitation to leisureliness was part of Gandhi's proselytization of what Hofmeyr calls "slow reading." This reading experience is markedly different from Benedict Anderson's theory that newspapers created community through the illusion of simultaneity—the perception by readers that events were occurring as they read them.[75] Hofmeyr argues that this emphasis on slow reading differentiates the periodical from the newspaper. In slow-moving letters as well as lengthy philosophical and political tracts, *Indian Opinion* aimed to inculcate in readers a different mode of reading focused on a slower tempo and a more

[73] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 81.
[74] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 83. "Our Weekly London Letter: (From our Special Correspondent)," appeared in *IO*, 8 July 1905, 5 August-26 August 1905, 7 October 1905, 28 October 1905, 9 December 1905, 16 December 1905, 13 January 1906, 17 January 1906, 17 March 1906, 16 May 1906, 9 June 1906, 8 September 1906, 6 October 1906, 17 October 1906. In 1907 this changed to a "monthly" letter, appearing under various titles, which was published on a more or less monthly basis in the first half of 1907 and intermittently from 1910 through 1914.
[75] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1983, 1991), 35.

contemplative absorption of information.[76] Yet *Indian Opinion* was not just Gandhi's tool of education and philosophical reflection. It also served as organizer and precipitator of political protests. The slow reading method was insufficient to this purpose.

As a result, *Indian Opinion*, like its contemporaries, used telegrams to provide news of ongoing political activity. Particularly during times of heightened conflict, such as during new stages in the passive resistance movement or during the Komagata Maru's journey, articles consisting entirely of republished telegrams carried information on activity across the empire. For example, Taraknath Das telegraphed from Berkeley to Vancouver that he had been arrested for publishing *Ghadr* and advocating rebellion. Rahim published this telegram four days later in the April edition of *The Hindustanee*.[77] Both *Indian Opinion* and *African Chronicle* intermittently used "special correspondents" to report on political activity at other locations. *African Chronicle* hired correspondents to report on Transvaal and Pietermaritzburg political activity intermittently between 1911 to 1913.[78] During the 1913 strike, *African Chronicle* also carried reports from their "City Correspondent" in Durban, as well as correspondents from Newcastle, Mossdale, and Dundee. It is unclear whether these were specially deputized correspondents paid to cover the strike or whether they were individuals who voluntarily wrote in to the paper. However, Aiyar's decision to capitalize the title of Correspondent imbued these reports

[76] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 81-2, 138.
[77] "Telegram," *Hindustanee*, April 1914.
[78] "Suspension of the Transvaal Meeting: Full Report of the Meeting: (From our correspondent)," *AC*, 6 May 1911; "Maritzburg Items: (from our Correspondent)," *AC*, 10 June 1911; "Mr. Gokhale's Projected Visit: Mass Meeting of Indians in Transvaal: Grand Reception to be accorded: (From Our Own Correspondent)," *AC*, 31 August 1912; "Maritzburg News: (From our own Correspondent)," *AC*, 4 January 1913, 11 January 1913, and 18 January 1913. These jobs were often short-lived—the Maritzburg correspondent noted on 4 January 1913, "owing to unforeseen causes my little service to your paper was abruptly stopped. From this year, however, I propose to contribute such news matters as are worth recording in these columns." Despite this new years' resolution, his columns ceased after the month of January.

with an official authority.[79] From 20 July to 23 November 1907 and 10 June to 29 August 1908, *Indian Opinion* carried a column almost every week entitled "Late News: Special Telegrams" which carried reports of passive resisters activities, as well as telegrams of support from beyond the Transvaal and press coverage from across the empire. This feature continued to appear on a more sporadic basis through June 1910, appearing also under the headline "Latest Telegrams from the Transvaal: Our Special Telegraphic Service."[80] In marked contrast to Gandhi's disavowal of modern technology and the thoughtless acceleration that they precipitated, these articles emphasized *IO*'s use of communication technology to bring its readers the very latest news.[81] By printing the date and place from which these telegrams were sent, *Indian Opinion* was including its readers in the action of the passive resistance movement, as it spread from Johannesburg to more outlying towns including Klerksdorp, Zeerust, Volksrust, and Pietersburg. *African Chronicle* emphasized the urgency of this information by marking those telegrams which were "specials" or "lates".[82] Like *IO's* London letters, these created a sense of community across geographical and temporal divides, but, in direct contrast to the more leisurely letter format, telegrams were intended to create a sense of urgency amongst readers, and to engage them—imaginatively and hopefully physically--in direct action in solidarity with the distant comrades they were reading about. For editors who saw their

[79] *AC*, 1 November 1913; "Progress of Passive Resistance," AC, 8 November 1913; *AC*, 29 November 1913.
[80] "Late News: Special Telegrams," *IO*, 20 July 1907, 27 July, 3 August, 17 August, 24 August, 14 September-23 November, 18 December, 11 January 1908, 25 January, 22 February, 14 March, 10 June, 11 July, 18 July, 25 July, 15 August, 22 August, 29 August, 19 September; "Latest Telegrams from the Transvaal," 10 October 1908, 17 October, 21 November, 28 November, 5 December; "Latest Telegrams from the Transvaal: Our Special Telegraphic Service," 2 January 1909, 31 January, 13 February-13 March; "Latest Telegrams," 19 June 1909; "Latest Telegrams from the Transvaal," 17 July 1909.
[81] Headrick, "Double-Edged Sword," 62.
[82] This list of telegrams is from the 1 November 1913 issue, but is a representative sample. Other issues contained more telegrams from India and London, as news of passive resistance spread.

periodicals turning readers into political activists, the repeated emphasis on related political activity in different times and spaces was key to bolstering their readers' sense of engagement with the issues.

The accumulation of telegrams, too, held a meaning: more telegrams denoted more activity, and so the repeated appearance of lengthy columns of telegram contents provided evidence meant to encourage Indian readers and to warn the government. While the reproduction of telegrams created a sense of the depth of the movement, the recording of their place of origin indicated the breadth of activity. In just one issue, *African Chronicle* offered a running list of telegrams and telephone calls from London, Johannesburg, Port Shepstone, Stanger, Bombay, Ladysmith, Simla, Durban, Port Elizabeth, Madras, and Umzinto.[83] *IO*'s telegraphic specials included messages of support from across the empire, including Natal, the Cape Colony, London, Nairobi, and Chinde in addition to other articles which described telegrams of support from India, the US, and elsewhere.[84] Telegraphic special articles contained news of press coverage from British newspapers.[85] The fact that passive resistance was being reported on by British papers was not only considered newsworthy, it was considered important enough to be cabled to editors for immediate distribution. Telegrams from distant locations indicated to the public and to the government that immigration restriction and other discriminatory legislation was not just a local concern; it was an imperial problem. For the relatively small population of Indians in South Africa and Canada, telegrams from "the silent

[83] This list of telegrams is from the 29 November 1913 issue, but is a representative sample.
[84] "Telegraphic Messages: Encouragement for Resisters," *IO*, 10 August 1907 and 17 August 1907; "Zoutpansberg 'Registrations': An Inglorious Fiasco: From our Pietersburg correspondent," *IO*, 17 August 1907.
[85] *Manchester Guardian, Daily Telegraph, Review of Reviews, Daily Graphic, Statist, Birmingham Post, Transvaal Leader, Pretoria News* are only some of the papers included in "Late News: Special Telegrams" articles.

millions" of the subcontinent could be used to prove to colonial governments that they had to reckon not just with local opinion but also with the mass of subcontinental nationalists.

Reporting Diaspora, Creating Community

Along with official government documents, public meetings of political organizations were also regularly reported in great detail. The meetings of local urban or provincial political and religious organizations as well as national political organizations in the colonies, India, and England were all assiduously reported.[86] These events were heralded by announcements weeks in advance and often simultaneously reported in several articles, some offering summary and some transcription of the events. By announcing and describing these events in great detail, the impact and audience of small political organizations were greatly expanded.

The political texts contained in these meetings—speeches, resolutions, debates—were, of course, of the first importance. Newspapers would quote, paraphrase, or summarize entire speeches, sometimes offering all three modes of reproduction or, in the case of important speeches, quoting them in multiple articles and across several issues.[87] Although editors did provide simple summaries of political events, particularly when pressed for space, the general intention in reporting on these meetings was to reproduce rather than paraphrase their content. Editors not only quoted speeches made by organizational leaders, they reported on many other speakers' participation. *The Hindustanee* reported that an English speaker referred to Naoroji's economic drain theory

[86] Ballantyne, "Reading," 50; Mesthrie, "From Advocacy to Mobilization," 103; Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 39; Swan, *Gandhi*, 152-3; Basran and Bolaria, *Sikhs in Canada*, 109.
[87] "Union Parliament: Immigrant's Restriction Bill, *AC*, 3 May-31 May 1913 and 14 June 1913; "The Indian commission," *AC*, 31 January-7 March 1914; " "Indian Before the U.S.A. Senate," *IV*, 5 December and 12 December 1919; "The Protector's Report: General Summary," *IO*, 5 August and 12 August 1905.

to which "The Chairman replied that the British were there in India to exploit, and they never intended to give anything in return. Bhai Nabhi Ram corrected the chairman by supplementing that the British in return for the Thirty Million Pounds Sterling drawn from India every year did give in return, the famine, drink habit and insolence."[88] This report captured the energy and rhythm of political give-and-take as speakers riffed on each other's statements to build a critique of the British Raj.

The use of extensive quotations from political meetings allowed for many voices, even those who contradicted each other or who disagreed with the politics of the meeting's leaders. *Indian Views* gave direct quotations of criticism of Gandhi by speakers including H. O. Ally, a prominent Muslim merchant and political leader, Vere Stent, editor of the *Pretoria News*, and two unnamed Muslim societies, as well as Gandhi's rebuttal. The chairman's desire to contain political dissent is reflected in the *Rand Daily Mail*'s observation that "At…signs of trouble brewing…the chairman closed the meeting."[89] A correspondent to *African Chronicle* reported on an adversarial meeting between Aiyar and Joseph Royeppen and K. R. Nayanah, which "soon degenerated into a veritable bear garden…past matters were raked up and dirty linen in plenty was soon soused in the soap suds."[90] Although the author of the article clearly disagreed with Royeppen and Nayanah, he noted approvingly that "I have the Editor's word that he is willing to print any other account even from the obstruction party thus showing his

[88] "Mass Meeting of the Hindustanees Re Komagata Maru," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.
[89] *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in "No Compromise; Great Mass Meeting at Johannesburg: Mr. Gandhi in a Tight Corner: Declines to Accept Challenge to Hold Mass Meeting: Full Accounts Asked For: Chairman Rescues Him from Trouble: Strong Speeches against 'Settlement': £200 Cable," *IV*, 24 July 1914.
[90] Raeburn Munro, "A Memorable Meeting: Obstructionists in Force," *AC*, 23 September 1911.

magnanimity."[91] These articles reproduced a sense of the cacophony of political opinion and implicitly invited the reader to "join" an ongoing conversation.

Editors did discriminate on the material they reproduced, however, often privileging English-language speeches. While non-English speeches or debates were reported on, they were not quoted and rarely paraphrased. Often articles would simply note that "so and so made remarks in Gujarati." Interestingly, even in dual-language publications, non-English speeches were not translated in the English sections of the papers.[92] This practice mirrored the general trend of dual-language publications, which was to create different, often quite distinctive, material for each language, rather than providing a simple translation of material common to both segments.[93] Given that editors presented themselves as translator and mediator between English and Indian society, why would they leave non-English speeches untranslated?

Sometimes this had to do with the linguistic capabilities of the reporter or editor. For instance, in reporting a Durban mass meeting of the NIC, Aiyar wrote that "Mr. M. C. Anglia severely cross-examined Mr. Gandhi in the Gujarati language and although, the writer of this article does not understand the language, yet those who are conversant with it told us that Mr. Gandhi was cornered in many a point."[94] However, Aiyar could not give his reader any specifics on what those points were. The subtitle for his article "Great Confusion: Nothing Done" reflects the chaos that occurred when linguistic divisions intersected with political disagreements.

---

[91] Ibid.
[92] Further research is needed to see if this trend held true in the Gujarati, Hindi, or Tamil sections of dual-language publications.
[93] Hans, "Punjabi Press," 888.
[94] "Last Sunday's Meeting: Great Confusion: Nothing Done," *AC*, 18 October 1913.

Refusing to translate speeches in Indian languages could be used to obscure radical or divisive politics. Sometimes, as was the case with Ghadr activists, vernacular politics were much more radical and anti-colonial than what was said in English.[95] At other times, the language barrier worked to prevent European sympathizers from understanding internal disputes. At a meeting in Ferreira, a Hindu speaking in Gujarati accused Indians who opposed Gandhi of being "kafirs", a word which carried religious and racial connotations.[96] The Muslims present objected strongly, even threatening violence against the speaker. However, because this occurred in Gujarati, "The Europeans present at the meeting were kept in the dark as to the meaning of this little interlude."[97] Ironically, the appearance of this report in the *Natal Mercury*, and subsequently in *African Chronicle*, indicates that someone eventually translated the exchange. However, the article claims that English-speakers at the meeting were unaware of the nature of the conflict. The language barrier served to keep internal divisions from being exposed to European criticism, allowing English-language speakers and writers to present the most united face of the movement.[98]

At other times, the labor involved in translating such speeches may have been too much for already over-worked editors, printers, and compositors. Regardless of intent, such practices created a differential citizenship that clearly demarcated the limits of a politics of inclusion. Diasporic editors might enable political meetings and ideas to

[95] Husain Rahim's English-language *Hindustanee*, for example, while highly critical of the Canadian immigration department, contained none of the attacks on the British empire that the vernacular *Ghadr* espoused, even though Rahim was a member of the Ghadr Party.
[96] Originally meaning "infidel" or non-Muslim, whites and Indians alike in South Africa as a racial slur for black Africans. The *AC* article only noted the religious meaning, however.
[97] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Islam Insulted: Word 'Kafir' Means Bloodshed," *AC*, 8 November 1913.
[98] Both Mesthrie and Hofmeyr indicate that the Gujarati columns of Indian Opinion were much less guarded in their political stance and less impersonal in tone than the English section of the paper (Mesthrie, "Advocacy," 119; Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 135).

transcend space and time, but the linguistic (and related racial and class) divisions remained intact. Even in dual language publications, print citizenship was segregated by language.

The political content of the meetings' orators, however, was only one part of the events' recreation in newspaper reports. Reports of political meetings provided both entertainment and informational value, offering readers a chance to "experience" organizational affairs from a distance. As with the addresses and petitions (see chapter five), production value mattered: political activists put great effort and resources into creating spectacles and newspaper editors responded to this, describing the location where events were held as well as the food offered and any decorations on display. Gokhale visited South Africa from 22 October to 7 November 1912. The *Transvaal Leader* described the reception as being "of typical Oriental warmth and magnificence."[99] *Indian Opinion* modified this racialized description of the event by focusing instead on the loyalist connotations of the reception with the byline "Johannesburg Greets Mr. Gokhale in Right Royal Style."[100] This description aligned Gokhale's reception with earlier celebrations of British monarchs and imperial politicians.

For particularly important events, multiple pages and print culture forms had to be utilized to properly celebrate the occasion. Individual descriptions of the many receptions and public meetings constituted the bulk of *Indian Opinion* material through 7 December, in addition to articles as far back as 31 August reporting on the progress of various reception committees' plans. In addition, *Indian Opinion* advertised the publication of an

[99] *Transvaal Leader*, quoted in "A Round of Receptions: Johannesburg Greets Mr. Gokhale in Right Royal Style," *IO*, 9 November 1912.
[100] "A Round of Receptions: Johannesburg Greets Mr. Gokhale in Right Royal Style," *IO*, 9 November 1912.

"illustrated Souvenir" of Gokhale's South African tour, containing "a full report of all the functions, the speeches, and press comments…Interesting photographs have been taken of various functions and of some of the addresses presented, and these will appear in a supplement."[101] Once printed, the souvenir contained "the diary of the tour, and a report of every important function from Cape Town to Pretoria. There are a great many illustrations, including interesting 'snap-shots,' cartoons, etc."[102] For those who could not afford the souvenir, *Indian Opinion* reprinted a photograph from *The Transvaal Leader* of the Johannesburg reception in front of the Triumphal Ark erected in Gokhale's honor. These documents served multiple purposes. First, the sale of the souvenir and photograph raised additional money for the International Printing Press. Second, the tiered production of printed mementos of the event created a sense of community that was simultaneously horizontal and hierarchical. *Indian Opinion* readers who were barred from attending these events by reasons of distance or class could vicariously participate in them through the newspaper, souvenir, and photograph. Readers who had been able to attend would be able to prolong their experience through reading and rereading, as well as perhaps being able to relish seeing their name or person reproduced in print or photograph. And while the option of buying a photograph rather than the souvenir extended this participation to poorer members of the community, wealthier members could differentiate their experience by memorializing it with the more expensive, larger, and more detailed souvenir.

[101] "A Special Souvinir [sic]," *IO*, 23 November 1912. This was supposed to be printed by International Printing Press, but owing to time and labor demands, it was produced instead by the *Transvaal Leader* Printing Works ("'Indian Opinion' Souvenir: Of Mr. Gokhale's Visit," *IO*, 30 November 1912).
[102] "'Indian Opinion' Souvenir: Of Mr. Gokhale's Visit," *IO*, 30 November 1912.

Although the coverage of Gokhale's visit was exceptional in quantity because of the length of his visit, the quality of reporting on details of schedule, food, and entertainment was not unusual. Food and decorations were part of the political experience in which editors wanted to immerse their readers. For instance, *Indian Opinion* spent three pages of one issue and one page of a subsequent issue describing the farewell reception for European supporter and Gandhi biographer Joseph Doke.[103] In addition to a summary of some speeches and verbatim reports of others, the full menu of the "vegetarian banquet" was given, with individual dishes listed under course headings. The article also provided the names of those who directed the menu as well as the names of a few of the "European and Indian volunteers" who labored in the kitchen "practically the whole day."[104] Naming these supporters allowed the newspapers (and the political organizations they backed) to publicly recognize prominent community members and donors. This recognition (which also served as free advertisement for these businessmen) was designed to induce them to continue giving their time and money to similar political events. In this instance, the naming of the workers preparing food also served Gandhi's purpose of valorizing male participation in traditionally female forms of labor, as well as promoting a vegetarian lifestyle.[105] Food was an integral part of the political experience and community building that newspapers and political organizations collaborated to produce.

[103] "Banquet to the Rev. J. J. Doke: A Crowded Gathering of Europeans and Indians," *IO*, 26 February 1910; "The Doke Banquet: Speeches of Messrs. Gandhi, W. Hosken M.L.A., and the Rev. Doke," *IO,* 5 March 1910. Even then, the second article ended mid-word due to a printer's error or a conflict of space.
[104] "Banquet to the Rev. J. J. Doke: A Crowded Gathering of Europeans and Indians," *IO*, 26 February 1910.
[105] The article notes that thirty men were "assisted" by three women in food preparation.

In addition, the presence and presentation of food tapped into wider political judgments. The appropriate—or inappropriate—presence of food often reinforced individuals' approbation or criticism of a political event. An "Observer" for *African Chronicle* description of an "At Home" held by the Durban Indian Society weighed both food and politics in the balance. Observer had hoped that Durban Indian Society leaders would take the occasion to announce that they were joining the passive resistance movement. They did not, however, and Observer noted that "had it not been for the light refreshment I would, perhaps, have been disheartened."[106] In the case of the Durban Indian Society, the refreshments served compensated for or even enhanced the politics on offer.[107] On other occasions, however, the levity of refreshments could aggravate the impropriety of political behavior. Aiyar criticized the NIC for a meeting at which "the hosts and the guests had an exchange of mutual congratulation and thanks giving [sic] while the audience sat unperturbed helping themselves to the fruits and other refreshments. This is a novel kind of according reception to public men and if the leaders of the Indian community persist in adopting the same procedure hereafter, we would deem it our duty to protest, in the name of the community, against using the name of the Natal Indian Congress."[108] Already skeptical of the efficacy of the passive resistance movement, Aiyar was further disgusted by the NIC's use of community funds and prestige to host a celebratory event with the passive resistance movement still unfinished. At the other end of the spectrum, *Indian Opinion* reminded its readers on 5 October 1912

[106] Observer [pseud.], "Current Topics: Notes and Comments: Durban Indian Society," *AC*, 25 June 1910.
[107] "Durban Indian Society," *AC*, 24 September 1910.
[108] "Reception to European Sympathisers of the Passive Resistance movement," *AC*, 25 November 1911. A subsequent article recorded that *AC* had since been told that the event was a private function not funded by the NIC. However, the article noted that the invitation they received "lead us to believe that it was a Congress reception" and that for a Congress event there were not enough speeches and too much food. The article concluded that they would leave it to readers to decide which version of events was true ("Reception to European Sympathisers," *AC*, 2 December 1911).

that Gokhale was due to arrive in Cape Town on 26 October and that the reception committee should use the time to ensure a successful welcome and visit.[109] Parties, ceremonies, and galas were political events, and the capacity of the community to properly fete its leaders was a crucial component of their political acumen and fitness for citizenship.

Lengthy descriptions of decorations and food also had the effect of recreating the scene for readers, inviting a transnational, interracial, and cross-class audience to share in the entire event, rather than simply appreciating the political resolutions made. *IO*'s description of one reception described how Parsee Rustomjee's yard had been turned into a "*shamtana*," or raised canopy, for passive resisters, who were feted with speeches in Hindustani, Tamil, and English and given engraved addresses. The audience of 1,000 celebrated in a yard with a platform decorated with flags, bunting, and four petrolite lamps.[110] While this article focused on the setting, others emphasized the entertainment value of political events. *India* advertised "An Indian entertainment, with tableaux, music, and lantern slides...in aid of the fund for Indians in South Africa."[111] *India*'s announcement of this event also stated that songs and recitations would be performed in English, Bengali, Urdu and Persian.[112] *The Hindustanee* reported that a subsequent event, also in Caxton Hall, London, in aid of South African Indians entertained its attendees with lantern slides of Gandhi, Gokhale, Polak, Kallenback [sic], and other passive resisters as well as the reading of a poem composed on the women of India.[113] *Ghadr*

[109] "From the Editor's Chair: Hon. Mr. Gokhale's Visit," *IO*, 5 October 1912.
[110] "Welcome to Mr. Polak and the Passive Resisters: A Unique Address: 600 Signatories," *IO*, 8 October 1910.
[111] "Notes and News," *India*, 12 December 1913.
[112] "British Indians in South Africa: London Indians and the Struggle," *India*, 23 January 1914.
[113] *Hindustanee*, 1 March 1914.

reported that at a meeting in Sacramento speeches were given on the South African situation, accompanied by songs and an hour of lantern slides.[114] While *India* announced these events in advance in order to drum up support for them, the *Hindustanee* and *Ghadr* spent precious resources describing the entertainment given at events that took place in the past, and, in one case, almost 5,000 miles away. Why, if not to recreate the event in a virtual reality that allowed activists in diaspora to "participate" in each other's political proceedings? In order to make this experience as concrete as possible, editors reproduced not only the political ideas and language being used, but also the very material conditions in which those meetings took place. Food, entertainment, and decoration were crucial components of the political experience.

These reports transformed solitary, isolated spatio-temporal events into an ongoing polity in which all subscribers could participate, regardless of location, membership, or time. Editors obliquely instructed their readers to attend these events in person where possible, announcing political meetings ahead of time and providing information on place, time, and purpose of the event. But their reports on these meetings extended the reach of these organizations beyond their immediate locale. By recreating political meetings in exceptional detail, frequently providing verbatim reports of the speeches and resolutions, as well as elaborate descriptions of the event's location and the food or decorations on offer, editors drew their readers into a virtual reality in which they were participants in long-distant (geographically and/or temporally) events. Readers "attended" these political meetings by proxy. Obviously, this form of participation had its limitations—readers could not, for example, vote on resolutions already passed. But they

[114] "A Meeting at Sacramento," *Ghadr*, typescript headed "Abridged translation of passages from the issue of the 6th January" [1914?], SAB GG LEER Volume 900, folder 15/713.

could, and did, write in to the newspapers with their opinions on what previous political meetings had achieved or failed to achieve.

In addition to reporting the give and take of political debate at past meetings, newspapers extended that discussion to include editor, column authors, and readers. Rather than simply providing an informational window onto past political events, newspaper editors actively solicited their readers' participation, first through announcing the meetings in advance and second through their implicit invitation to readers to weigh in on community decisions. Readers responded with criticisms of past meetings and suggestions for future meetings and resolutions. Shortly after the announcement that Gokhale would be coming to South Africa, a correspondent in the *African Chronicle*'s Tamil columns suggested that working men form a reception committee for him. Aiyar endorsed this idea, and published a summary of the suggestion in his English columns in order to gain more traction for it.[115] Another correspondent complained that there were too many societies, particularly religious societies, and no non-sectarian body. Furthermore, she accused the Durban Indian Society of being "like the shaddow [sic] of the shade" and asked "all especially the 'leaders,' 'Reformers,' 'Agitators' and those who believe in Karmakhand [sic] philosophy to consider the advantage of putting some fire into this body."[116] This delayed contribution enabled a participatory citizenship not limited to political organizations' membership. Readers who could not, by reason of physical distance or class divides, join political organizations used the newspapers as a public domain in which they engaged and expanded the terms of debate. Even those with limited education could join in. A correspondent named Ramasamy wrote to *African*

[115] "Professor Gokhale's Visit," *AC*, 21 September 1912.
[116] Soortay-Coloured-Girl [pseud.], "Correspondence: Too Many Societies," *AC*, 24 September 1910.

Chronicle suggesting that the Licensing Bill, rather than targeting Indian storekeepers, should prevent European wholesalers from selling to Indians. Once wealthy Europeans were threatened by the bill, "the strong arm of the Capitalist would be put in defiance of the present drastic measures." Ramasamy concluded his letter by asking for indulgence "for the disjointed manner no doubt in which my letter appears, as I am a Colonial born indian [sic] and the son of a Farmer, my education is poor and limited owing to European prejudice and a soft government."[117] Despite embarrassment about his English language skills, Ramasamy felt that he could contribute to the political debate. As the participation of Ramasamy and others like him indicates, these periodicals expanded the political conversation to a larger and more geographically and socio-economically diverse audience. It was in these papers that a largely disenfranchised population articulated and *enacted* forms of citizenship.

Activism in the Newspaper

The relationship between activism and print culture was one of complex and multifaceted reciprocity. Editors often recommended that political organizations develop print culture outreach programs. *The Hindustanee* urged the INC to form a "literature bureau…for the sale of Congress literature" particularly in the vernaculars. "A cheap and easy supply of literature on the political questions of India would be a potent factor in spreading the propaganda of the Congress…Such organization and education of the masses would greatly relieve the anarchist tendencies of the extremists."[118] Notably, the editor of the *Hindustanee*, Husain Rahim, despite being a member of the radical Ghadr party that was highly critical of the INC, used his English-language paper to advocate for

[117] Ramasamy, "Correspondence: An Indian's Dilemma," *AC*, 1 August 1908.
[118] "Indian National congress," *Hindustanee*, February 1914.

the spread of informational vernacular literature. Rahim argued that this technique would encourage nationalism while slowing radicalism in the subcontinent. This may well have been part of Rahim's strategy of appealing to liberal white Canadian readers in English-language material while taking a more radical approach in vernacular publications (see chapter one).

In addition to urging other organizations to publish educational material, editors in South Africa and Canada often used their own printing presses to create petitions and addresses at the behest of local political organizations. In Toronto and Vancouver, Sunder Singh used his printing press, not only to create several Indo-Canadian periodicals but also to print material, including petitions, pamphlets, and circulars for the Canada India Committee and probably also for the Hindu Friends Society.[119] *African Chronicle* published an article on a NIPU petition objecting to racial discrimination in the draft Constitution for the Union and admonished its readers to "roll up in large numbers, and assist us in forwarding the petition without delay."[120] A letter from Gandhi to Polak interspersed directions for printing and distributing political appeals with directions for publicizing these documents in *Indian Opinion*. He told Polak that the appeals

> "~~should be printed there and signed by as many as possible. Send out volunteers. There should be no delay. Print them in advance in I.O. [sic] — next week. Send out proper circulars as before. The women's appeal…and these shd [sic] appear in I.O. [sic] without fail next week. You may write a short leader on the 3 and announce that they are being signed. The two Indian appeals shd [sic] be translated into two 3 languages as before. They shd [sic] be widely distributed in India.~~ They shd [sic] go to every paper and public body. ~~Let Phoenix per~~ Let Phoenix people do the sending if you think proper and let them be paid for it. There shd [sic] be a circular

[119] This claim is based on circumstantial evidence: Sunder Singh was editor of the *Aryan*, organizer of the Canada India Committee, and signatory to petitions from the Hindu Friend Society. The frequent use of identical language across these organizations indicates that he probably had a role in the writing and printing of all these documents.
[120] "Natal Indian Patriotic Union," *AC*, 5 June 1909.

> letter. The chairman shd [sic] forward the appeal…Keep copies of signatures. They need not be signed in duplicates."[121]

These detailed instructions indicate the amount of labor involved in political printing. Phoenix volunteers were responsible for translating, writing, and distributing these appeals to an international audience, as well as writing and printing a circular letter and keeping track of signatures on the petition. They were also to re-print these appeals in *Indian Opinion*. Gandhi was not unusual in this. The printing presses of diasporic editors were intimately involved in the production of political documents such as petitions, resolutions, and pamphlets.[122]

Printing could be used raise money and awareness for causes, even as the labor of printing this material simultaneously required more money from supporters. Aiyar published a pamphlet on the £3 Indian License question which was advertised in *African Chronicle* for 1 shilling per copy, including one penny postage charge for "upcountry orders." The article explained that because the committee was "essentially a working-man's organisation" they needed the funds and the *African Chronicle* article asked sympathizers to "help this movement by purchasing this pamphlet."[123] Another article issued a call for funds, explaining that "There are illustrative pamphlets to be printed and a campaign to be started in the public press. Leading Europeans to be interviewed and meetings to be arranged and addressed throughout Natal. An immense deal of correspondence has necessarily to be undertaken."[124] Implicit in this list was the understanding that Aiyar's printing press would do most of this labor. This connection

[121] Gandhi to H. S. L. Polak, n.d, BL MSS EUR B272/1909. The strikethrough appears in the original and it is possible that they denote which of Gandhi's instructions Polak had carried out.
[122] Hofmeyr et al., "Introduction," 5.
[123] "That £3 Tax: 'An Appeal to the Empire'" *AC*, 3 February 1912.
[124] "South African Indian Committee: To Repeal £3 Licence: Money Urgently Needed: Actions speak Louder than Words," *AC*, 28 October 1911.

was made explicit later in the article when it stated that subscription lists were printed and could be picked up at *African Chronicle*'s office. Aiyar further suggested that a weekly or monthly subscription could be donated by those who could not afford a lump sum payment.[125] Likewise Singh printed appeals for the Canada India Committee which were circulated throughout India, asking for volunteer workers to come to Canada and envisioning donations that would enable the organization to "spend about Rs 300/per month on a strong well managed and well written monthly magazine, paid stenographer and typist…and all located in a central house."[126] Editors used their printing presses as a place of political education, organization, and activism.

For *Ghadr* publications, this meant celebrating the role of the newspaper in sparking revolutionary action. The first issue of *Ghadr* claimed, "'This is not an Ashram but a fort from which a Cannonade on the English raj will be started.'"[127] Strikingly, the moderate British founder of the INC, William Wedderburn described *India*, the official organ of the INC, as "'a store-house from which arms and materials are supplied to all those who are willing to strike a blow on behalf of India.'"[128] Activists across the political spectrum understood the production of print culture to be a crucial part of political preparation. While Wedderburn's rhetoric of nationalist military violence was metaphorical, Ghadr activists saw political writing as the first step towards military resistance to British rule. *Ghadr* wrote that the party would "print newspapers and write books, and will arrange to give lectures…With these preparations the mutiny will not be

[125] Ibid.
[126] Sunder Singh and H. L. Davies, Canada India Committee Newsletter, n.d., LAC IB RG76, Vol 388, File 536999, R.O., part 2.
[127] Har Dayal, quoted in Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 36.
[128] Wedderburn, quoted in (Gregory, *India and East Africa*, 135)

long delayed."[129] Har Dayal told his readers to "Help the paper and be ready to start a revolution as soon as you return to India."[130]

In responding to the Raj's censorship of a book by Henry Hyndman and two Ghadr pamphlets, a *Ghadr* issue observed, "They have been excited by the pen. When they see the sword out of the sheath they will give up their consciousness."[131] Rendering the moment of contact between nationalist writing and British imperialism as one of both titillating and threatening sexual violence, Ghadr casts British officials as emotionally, physically, and sexually overpowered by the phallic symbols of pen and sword. This scene resonates strongly with British fears of Indian violence, especially sexual violence, in the wake of the Indian Mutiny of 1857. Jenny Sharpe argues that British fiction obsessively imagined the rape of British women by Indian rebels as a coded way of expressing the betrayal and fear experienced by the British government.[132] Here, *Ghadr* reworks that scenario to triumphantly imagine nationalist violence against the Raj. British officials appear as damsels in distress, who are emotionally, sexually, and physically overcome by nationalist violence, in word and in deed. Importantly, though—and distinct from most of the other editors—for Ghadr activists the pen was not mightier than the sword. For Ghadr activists, political writing was merely prelude to political violence.

---

[129] "The Difficulties of the English Government," *Ghadr*, VII and VIII, n.d., translation enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1, Microfilm Reel M-3). Another translation, probably of the same article, read *Ghadr* as saying that the nationalist party "has its agents in cities, in villages, in schools and colleges, in native States, in London, Paris, New York, San Francisco, Vancouver, Fiji and Natal….This newspaper 'Mutiny' is also its herald" ("The Difficulties of the British Gov," *Ghadr*, 23 December 1913, transl, SAB GG LEER Volume 900, folder 15/713).

[130] Har Dayal, quoted in "Meeting at Sacramento Cal. Strong Speeches of Hindus and Mahammedans [sic]," *Ghadr*, X, n.d., trans., Letter, Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, encloses translation, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1, Microfilm Reel M-3.

[131] Ghadr, 15 October 1920, trans., LAC IB RG76, Volume388, File 536999, British, part 2, Microfilm Reel C-10282)

[132] Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1993), chapter three.

Although *Ghadr*'s political goals differed from the other organizations and editors under analysis here, there was a similar symbiotic exchange between printed material and political action amongst editors with less radical politics. Editors issued calls for direct political action on crucial issues, particularly when they felt that the extant organizations were not doing enough on the subject. Often impatient with the NIC's timidity and insularity, Aiyar wrote in 1901 that colonial Indians "have been relying too much on the Natal Indian Congress...The Congress is not a body that would wake up or rather rise up to the occasion." Simultaneously criticizing the inaction of both colonial Indians and the NIC, Aiyar urged his readers to take independent action. With the outbreak of World War I, *Indian Views* called upon the South African Government to "raise an Indian Corps here for active service in Africa or elsewhere" and, failing to receive a response, took it upon themselves to organize a volunteer brigade.[133] The next issue asked "members of the Indian Ambulance Corps who served in the Boer war and the Natal Native Rebellion [to] please send their names and present address to Advocate Gabriel, International Arcade West Street Durban."[134] Sometimes readers and editors collaborated to produce political protests independent of existing organizations. At the end of the Anglo-Boer War, *Colonial Indian News* reported on restrictions imposed upon Indian refugees who wished to return to the Transvaal. Apparently, "many of them have requested us to communicate their protest through the Columns of the 'Colonial Indian News."[135] Aiyar responded in the same issue saying that a memorial should instead be addressed to Milner.[136] In this exchange, readers turned to the newspaper to advocate on their behalf, while the editor in

[133] "Indians and the War," *IV*, 21 August 1914.
[134] "Indian Ambulance Corps," *IV*, 28 August 1914.
[135] "Indians in the Transvaal," *CIN*, 18 October 1901.
[136] "Return of Refuges," *CIN*, 18 October 1901.

turn urged readers to take direct political action. Such directives were not simply aimed at local readers, but also addressed subcontinental political bodies. One reader wrote a letter to the *Hindustanee* asking Sikhs in India to support Indians in Canada in their fight for family immigration. The article closed with a Sikh greeting: "WAHIGURU JI KA KHALSA, WAHIFURU JI KI FATEH" [Wonderful lord Khalsa, Victory to the Wonderful Lord].[137] Diasporic activists considered themselves part of a transnational political community, enabling them to advise not only local institutions but activists, editors, and organizations across the empire.

P. S. Aiyar was exceptional in his use of the newspaper to start new political organizations. Aiyar was a founder of the South African Indian Committee on the £3 tax and the Natal Indian Patriotic Union (NIPU), as well as a supporter of the Colonial-Born Indian Association (CBIA) and the South African Indian Congress (SAIC). One can see the origins of all of these political organizations in *African Chronicle*, but most clearly with the creation of the Committee on the £3 tax. As early as 1908, Aiyar pointed out that both the Natal Indian Patriotic Union and the Indian National Progressive Association were composed of educated young men who opposed indenture and the £3 tax. Aiyar proposed the amalgamation of the two bodies since they had the same goals and "greater strength engenders greater vitality and power."[138] After publishing a series of articles protesting the £3 tax in 1910 and 1911, Aiyar reported that he had received "quite a number of enquiries for information and also quite a number of offers of help" in

[137] Rajah Singh, "Correspondence: An Appeal to Sikhs at Home," *Hindustanee*, January 1914, capitalization in the original, translation by Wikipedia.
[138] "Unity is Strength," *AC*, 15 August 1908. I cannot find a reference to the "Indian National Progressive Association." It is possible that Aiyar meant to refer to the Aryan Young Men's Progressive Association or the Umgeni Hindu Progressive Society, but it is more likely this refers to an institution that was too short lived to be recorded by historians. It is unclear whether this indicates that Aiyar's proposed unification was successful or not.

bringing pressure to bear on the Government to remove the £3 tax. Aiyar opined that this was a tangible goal for "practical politics" and that "it affected indentured, re-indentured and free Indians alike."[139] In response to these enquiries, Aiyar proposed in September 1911 to "roughly sketch the plan of campaign," which included forming local committees in country districts to organize meetings, collect subscriptions, and "deepen into activity the interest of the people." Speakers, pamphlets, and press would be used to educated European and Indian public opinion.[140] Since Muslim merchants did not receive the *African Chronicle*, Aiyar went with leading Muslim activist Dada Abdoola on personal calls to Durban Muslim leaders.[141] In addition to this plan for future work, Aiyar provided his readers with concrete means of immediate involvement. "Preachers, Missionaries, Schoolmasters, Storekeepers, Sirdars and educated Indians generally, need not wait for a specific invitation but each in his own circle begin now. For the present all enquiries should be addressed to the editor of this journal. Elsewhere in this issue readers will find a form of pledge which they can sign and send it, thus providing valuable information."[142] The pledge was issued in Tamil and English, enabling all literate readers in both communities to join the movement immediately, even if they were not willing to take up the mantle of leadership that Aiyar reserved for "educated Indians." At least one reader responded immediately, offering to act as Honorary Legal Adviser if needed.[143] The next issue informed readers that the first meeting to elect office holders would be held at Parsee Rustomjee's house.[144] Within three weeks, Aiyar had received over 160

[139] The £3 Licence," *AC*, 26 August 1911.
[140] "Campaign against £3 Licence," *AC*, 2 September 1911.
[141] "Reply to My Critics," *AC*, 23 September 1911.
[142] "Campaign against £3 Licence," *AC*, 2 September 1911.
[143] "Campaign against the £3 Licence," *AC*, 9 September 1911.
[144] Campaign against £3 License [sic]," *AC*, 16 September 1911.

written pledges of support, in addition to "verbal assurances through sirdars etc., of about 500 persons."[145] The "verbal assurances" indicates that illiterate indentured Indians were included in this political movement, in contrast to the more elite NIC. Aiyar housed the office of the committee at *African Chronicle*'s offices on 22 Cross Street in Durban.[146] Throughout 1911, *African Chronicle* continued to issue calls for assistance, financial support, and to offer publications and public meetings on the topic.[147] Although Gandhi eventually garnered more widespread attention with the dramatic strike of indentured Indian workers against the £3 tax in 1913, many supporters recognized that Aiyar had spearheaded opposition to the tax long before other political leaders.[148]

Not all of Aiyar's campaigns were as successful. The creation of a South Africa-wide Indian political body met with many delays. Aiyar first called for a unified South African Indian political organization in response to the South African Union. A correspondent to *African Chronicle* suggested that South African Indians have an annual congress like the INC, that it be called the "South African British Indian Conference," and be planned for July 1911.[149] This never materialized. Aiyar tried again in 1913, urging the Kimberley Indian Association to organize a South African Indian congress[150] and suggesting a South African Indian Conference to "discuss the situation from an entirely new and National [sic] standpoint" and to give voice " to those who differ from

[145] Reply to My Critics," *AC*, 23 September 1911; "Roll of Honour," *AC*, September 1911.
[146] "South African Indian Committee: To Repeal £3 Licence [sic]: Campaign against Injustice: Encouraging Beginning," *AC*, 14 October 1911.
[147] "South African Indian Committee: To Repeal £3 Licence: Money Urgently Needed: Actions speak Louder than Words," *AC*, 28 October 1911; "Information For Europeans," *AC*, 11 November 1911; "Prospect Hall Meeting," *AC*, 9 December 1911; "Campaign against £3 Licence: Meeting at the Point," *AC*, 16 December 1911; "South African Indian Committee for the Abolition of £3 Licence on ex-indentured Indians," *AC*, 27 January 1912, 3 February 1912, 10 February 1912, 17 February 1912, 24 February 1912, and 9 March 1912.
[148] "Telegram from Senator Campbell," *AC*, 4 July 1914.
[149] S. M. M., "Correspondence," *AC*, 6 August 1910.
[150] "Kimberley Indian Association," *AC*, 13 September 1913.

[the] Gandhi-Gokhale school of thought."[151] The Natal Indian Congress seconded this proposal and sent circular bodies out to some provincial organizations. Aiyar praised the NIC's support but suggested that the NIC contact *African Chronicle* for help with contact information and publication of circulars, indicating that Aiyar was wary about the NIC taking command of this project.[152] It's not entirely clear why the conference did not immediately materialize; perhaps it was due to these internal conflicts or perhaps to the outbreak of the world war. In any event, the first South African Indian Conference did not occur until 1919, at which point Aiyar congratulated the Cape British Indian Council on their hosting capacity.[153] Although successful at organizing local political bodies and projects, Aiyar seems to have repeatedly failed to establish a South African Indian political organization, although his support for this project remained steadfast through the 1910s.

There were also substantial delays between Aiyar's first proposal of a Colonial-Born Association and the eventual formation of such an organization. This association was first intimated in *African Chronicle* as the "Colonial League". Recurring column writer "Observer" noted that "The talk among the Colonial-born Indians is why should they not join hands under the banner of 'The Colonial League'" since the Natal Indian Patriotic Union was "apparently...defunct" and the NIC was too expensive for many colonial-borns to be members.[154] The Colonial-Born League disbanded after a meeting with Gandhi that convinced them that "an institution of this nature…would act more as an hinderence [sic] to the cause of the community" and that they should continue to

[151] From the Editor's Chair : Proposed Official Deputation to South Africa," *AC*, 20 September 1913.
[152] "Natal Indian Congress: Conference to be called," *AC*, 11 October 1913.
[153] The Cape British Indian Council," *AC*, 15 February 1919.
[154] Observer, "Current Topics: Notes and Comments: Colonial League," *AC*, 17 September 1910.

support "national" political bodies. *African Chronicle* conceded that this premise was "a sound one" but asked why Gandhi did not also urge sectional and racial organizations to disband in favor of national unification.[155] Only in 1911 was Aiyar able to congratulate the colonial-born population on finally organizing and urged them "adopted a firmer and more businesslike attitude" in differentiating themselves from the NIC by advocating for and educating poor Indians.[156]

Aiyar was not the only editor to use his paper as a forum through which to organize new political organizations, although he was one of the more successful. The *Aryan* asked its readers for help organizing a conference at which "the Hindu colonists in Canada, South Africa, Australia and other parts of the British Empire could meet once a year…As there are many problems which the Hindus as fellow-subjects of the Empire have in common."[157] Given that Sunder Singh, editor of the *Aryan*, was fairly alienated from most Canadian Indian activists, it's not surprising that this conference never panned out. Singh was more successful in suggesting that Indians in the US and Canada send representatives to England and the INC[158] and in asking for help from retired American missionaries.[159] Singh collaborated with several white Canadian religious figures, including the Reverends L. W. Hall and Thomas Wilkie, sharing resources and material as they published pamphlets and newspapers and organized public meetings, petitions, and political committees. Not all calls for political action transcended off the page, but in

[155] "News and Views," 1 October 1910.
[156] colonial-Born Movement," *AC*, 25 March 1911; Colonial-born Meeting," *AC*, 25 March 1911; Colonial Indian Petition," *AC*, 25 March 1911; What is in a Name?," *AC*, 1 April 1911;
[157] ("Hindu Colonists' Conference," *Aryan*, August 1911)
[158] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, June 1912. The next issue of the *Aryan* reported that the Vancouver Sikhs had decided to send a send deputation to England. Whether this decision stemmed from Singh's suggestion or from autonomous political action is unclear. ("Hindu Deputation to England," *Aryan*, July 1912).
[159] "News and Notes," *Aryan*, June 1912.

many instances, they did. The newspaper was a site for raising political awareness and working out intra-communal issues, but it also served as a catalyst for external action.

Transnational Fundraising

One of the most concrete forms by which newspaper editors encouraged participation in political movements was through fundraising. Editors issued calls to their readers to support local as well as distant diasporic or subcontinental political, communal, and educational activity, and imperial or national causes.[160] Just in 1914, the *Hindustanee* reported on fundraising efforts for Bhagwan Singh's and Har Dayal's deportation trial costs, wounded Gazi soldiers in the Turkish-Balkan War, the South African passive resisters, a United Provinces Famine Relief Fund, and a scholarship fund for Indian students in the US.[161] As these examples demonstrate, the causes chosen often reflected the unique networks of different diasporic communities. Canadian Indians, many of whom were from the United Provinces, collected $705 for the UP Famine Relief Fund. The *Hindustanee* reported the amounts raised as well as the names and pictures of the members of the Relief Fund Committee, while no such movement is recorded in South African newspapers.[162] Meanwhile, it was the East India Moslem League in Vancouver who raised support for their "wounded Gazi brothers."[163] In contrast, *Indian Views*, with its large Gujarati speaking readership, reported on Bombay nationalists raising money for the creation of a Gujarati school in the Transvaal, while *African Chronicle* repeatedly

[160] Frost, "Colonial Public Sphere," 88.
[161] "Where is Bhai Bhagwan Singh," *Hindustanee*, January 1914; "Har Dayal Says Officials Cannot Now Deport Him," *Hindustanee*, April 1914; "UP Famine Relief Fund," *Hindustanee*, May 1914 and June 1914. The appeal for the scholarship fund was circulated beyond North America to "Hindusthan [sic] leaders from India, Federated Malaya Straits, South Africa, Australia, British Guiana, Europe, and other parts of the world" (Taraknath Das, "The Work Before US," *Hindustanee*, May 1914).
[162] "U. P. Famine Relief Fund," *Hindustanee*, May 1914; "UP Famine Relief Fund," *Hindustnanee*, June 1914.
[163] *Hindustanee*, March 1914.

asked for donations for a Tamil school in Durban.[164] Readers used local and print culture networks strategically, as when M. Suntharamoorthee Pillay wrote a letter to *African Chronicle* asking readers to raise money to send Rangasamy Padayachee home to India. Padayachee had taught Tamil in a school in Port Elizabeth for 22 years and Pillay asked that the community of Tamil readers pay for his passage to India.[165] Another correspondent wrote that he had read in *African Chronicle*'s Tamil columns a letter suggesting that the *African Chronicle* start a fund for poor Indians. This correspondent wanted to write his response in English, presumably to spread the fundraising call to a wider audience.[166] Local, national, and transnational, these fundraising efforts utilized existing networks of religious, linguistic, or other communal identities.

Yet other fundraising campaigns transcended traditional diasporic networks, as when the Vancouver Khalsa Diwan raised at least $176 for South African passive resisters.[167] The passive resistance movement in South Africa received the most widespread financial support, with donations from as far away as England, Canada, Burma, and Japan, amongst other places.[168] This was due in large part to Gandhi's success harnessing the INC's energies, notably through the support of Naoroji in London and Gokhale in Bombay. The repeated mention of the passive resistance movement at annual INC meetings helped attract international attention. (Gandhi's zealousness in getting donations from overseas is particularly ironic given that in 1904, he urged *Indian*

---

[164] "Government Indian School (Transvaal)," *IV*, 31 July 1914; *AC*, 12 June 1909; "Hindu Tamil Institution," *AC*, 7 March 1914.
[165] letter from M. Suntharamoorthee Pillay, June 22, in *AC*, 4 July 1914.
[166] "Correspondence: Letter from Non Vanian [sic]," *AC*, 16 August 1913.
[167] *Hindustanee*, March 1914. This was likely separate from the *Sansar*'s fundraising drive of $14 in January 1914, given that Sunder Singh (editor of *Sansar*) was so alienated from the Khalsa Diwan's leadership ("The South African Fund," *Sansar*, 5 January 1914).
[168] Indians in Japan collected Rs. 5500 (The 28th Indian National Congress at Karachi (from *The Hindu*), quoted in *AC*, 31 January 1914. For an analysis of the disputes over Gandhi's handling of the passive resistance fund, see below.

Opinion readers *not* to contribute to an Australian organization protesting anti-Indian discrimination.)[169] The strategies used by Gandhi in the passive resistance movement, although they produced more money than other fundraising drives, were far from unique. Instead, they were part of an already flourishing system of activism that operated in large part through diasporic newspapers.

Editors zealously reported on the progress of fundraising, offering descriptions of amounts collected at meetings, forwarded to political organizations, and generated by readers.[170] Editors singled out communities and individuals who made contributions, frequently providing the names of large donors and the amounts received from them or specifying which outlying townships or distant locations had sent in money.[171] Much like contemporary non-profits' Annual Reports, these newspaper articles lauded the wealthiest donors, giving them public recognition as community leaders, and sometimes even providing business advertisements for them. For example, amongst the list of donors to the Tolstoy Farm, Gandhi noted that they had received "from Messrs. Garlick & Hands, wholesale merchants of Durban, a very fine blotting pad with diary and calendar

[169] Gandhi argued that "We think that every moral support should be extended to the mission, but as the problem in Australia is not necessarily the same as in South Africa it is impossible to divide the funds. Each community must be allowed to secure its own salvation, and for that purpose it is necessary that each should husband its own resources, and we hold that it is only thus that effective co-operation can be given" (British Indians in Australia," *IO*, 4 February 1904). Since *IO* supported other transnational donation drives before and after this article was published, perhaps Gandhi had a problem with this particular organization's politics.

[170] "Mass Meeting of the Hindustanees Re Komagata Maru," *Hindustanee*, June 1914; "The South African Fund," *Sansar*, January 1914; Meeting at Sacramento Cal. Strong Speeches of Hindus and Mahammedans [sic]," *Ghadr*, 6 January 1914, Letter, Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, encloses translation, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1. *Indian Opinion* ran a column with a running count of the money and signatures collected by the London passive resistance volunteers ("London passive Resistance Volunteers," *IO*, 8 January 1910

[171] "HYMA Tamil School," *AC*, 12 June 1909; "Help to Passive Resisters," *AC*, 17 December 1910; "A Munificent Gift," *AC*, 17 August 1912; "Pretoria Tamil Relief Fund," *IO*, 18 September 1909; "Bombay Ladies' Contribution: To the Transvaal Relief Fund," *IO*, 12 March 1910; "Collections in London: In Aid of Passive Resistance funds," *IO*, 10 September 1910; "A Great Day at Tolstoy Farm: Christmas Treat for Indian Families," *IO*, 31 December 1910.

for 1911 attached—just the thing for the office table."[172] Unlike some other donations that were considered impractical ("May I inform future donors that the settlers on the Farm do not wear or require stiff starched shirts?"), this office supply was praised in detail, along with the merchants' information, implicitly encouraging readers to frequent this store.[173]

While this practice emphasized prominent local support, reports on donations from distant locations reinforced the national and diasporic communities that editors envisioned.[174] During the passive resistance movement, subscriptions from outlying communities in the Cape Colony or ORC reinforced the sense that passive resistance was a national movement, concerning all South African Indians, not simply those in the Transvaal.[175] *Indian Opinion* even noted that the movement had support across racial lines, with fifty Coloured people from Oudtahoorn donating £5.[176] Donations from India bolstered claims that this was an international, imperial concern, stirring up nationalist unrest across the entire subcontinent.[177] Notes that money was collected from the All-

[172] "Items of Interest," *IO*, 31 December 1910.
[173] "Transvaal Notes: From Our Own Correspondent: Johannesburg Tuesday," *IO*, 20 August 1910. The contrast between a starched shirt being impractical while a diary and blotting pad were considered quite appropriate marks again how important the tools of print culture were to the political project of passive resistance. Gandhi and the "Tolstoyans" might reject Western clothing, but the trappings of "civilized" literacy remained crucial.
[174] *The Hindu*, quoted in "The 28th Indian National Congress at Karachi," *AC*, 31 January 1914; "Indian National Congress," *AC*, 3 January 1914; "India's help for the South African Indian," *AC*, 18 April 1914; *AC*, 18 December 1915; "Notes on the Transvaal Struggle: From Our Own Correspondent," *IO*, 3 April 1909; "Pretoria Tamil Relief Fund," *IO*, 18 September 1909; "Zanzibar Sympathy," *IO*, 14 January 1914.
[175] "Port Elizabeth Indian Support," *AC*, 13 December 1913, "Tongaat Meeting," *AC*, 4 December 1909; "Natal Indian Congress: Sympathy with Transvaal Indians: Subscription List Opened," *IO*, 6 July 1907; "A Cape Town Meeting: More Sympathy and Help," *IO*, 3 August 1907; "Passive Resistance: Umsinga Indians," *IO*, 3 August 1907; "Correspondence: Chinde Sympathisers," *IO*, 21 September 1907.
[176] "News in Brief," *IO*, 25 March 1914.
[177] "India's help for the South African Indian," *AC*, 18 April 1914; *Mahratta*, quoted in *AC*, 18 April 1914; "Bombay Ladies' Contribution: To the Transvaal Relief Fund," *IO*, 12 March 1910; "The Moslem League Conference: Takes up the Transvaal Question," 12 March 1910; *Punjabi*, quoted in "A Lahore Meeting: In Support of Transvaal Indians," *IO*, 2 April 1910; "Great Meeting in Calcutta," *IO*, 14 January 1914; "Ahmedabad Ladies' Meeting," *IO*, 18 February 1914; "Happenings in India," *IO*, 12 March, 26 March 1910 and 16 April 1910.

India Moslem League or the Bombay Ladies Association emphasized that this support was truly national, crossing geographic, religious, and gender divides. *African Chronicle* contained an account of fundraising for South African passive resisters at an INC meeting at which

> "The Congress was raised to a pitch of the highest enthusiasm. Notes, soverigns [sic], and silver were sent up to the platform in a continuous stream for nearly an hour, several ladies present not having money with them handed even their rings, and Mrs. Chowdhuri snatched her bangle from her hand and threw it on the platform at Mr. Surendranath's feet. When several thousand rupees had been contributed spontaneously from the audience, Mr. Surendranath announced that he was going round with his cap to collect form those who had not already subscribed, and as a result of this personal collection the total was carried to Rs. 15,000 actually collected and promised. One man who had not money with him tore off his silk puggaree [sic] and gave it up for the cause."[178]

This depiction of enthusiastic (and coerced) support indicated Indian nationalist solidarity, while reports of donations from Britons or colonists of European descent proved that this was an imperial issue arousing British sympathy and support even amongst conservative imperialists (see chapter two).[179]

Editors also took it upon themselves to monitor fundraising activity. Although Aiyar originally published a call for donations to the building of a "Gokhale Institute" for Natal Indians to meet, he subsequently insisted that organizers must explain how the required £3000 is to be raised and when he did not hear back, he refunded the money he

[178] "The Indian National Congress: Indignant Feeling Aroused on the Transvaal Question," *IO*, 12 February 1910; also quoted in "The Indian National Congress," *AC*, 19 February 1910.
[179] Aiyar thanked "a European gentleman" for his donation of £5 to the movement of for the repeal of the £3 tax ("Acknowledgement," *AC*, 10 February 1912). Gandhi calculated that London donated £386 to the passive resistance movement (*AC*, 18 December 1915). *Indian Opinion* ran a column with a running count of the money and signatures collected by the London passive resistance volunteers ("London Passive Resistance Volunteers," *IO*, 18 December 1909-15 January 1910, 5 February-16 April 1910, 30 April 1910-21 May 1910, 23 July 1910, 20 August 1910).

had received for the project.[180] Some editors involved themselves even further in fundraising efforts, not only keeping track of funds but actively soliciting donations from readers and directing readers to send donations to the editor, who would forward them to the requisite political body.[181]

The entangled relationship between editors, activists, newspapers, and political organizations was further complicated by the fact that editors often held dual positions as leaders of local political bodies. As a result, fundraising drives for political movements often involved siphoning money to a supportive newspaper. For instance, the *Hindustanee*, which was the official organ of the United India League, regularly carried ads for the UIL and money for the *Hindustanee* was raised at UIL's weekly propaganda meetings.[182] *The Indian Emigrant* explained to readers that the Emigration Fund, which gave money to relieve students and others stranded in foreign countries, had started from their journal and so they asked readers not only to donate to the Emigration Fund but also "to subscribe to our Journal to enable us to do some useful work for the mute, emigrants as well as stay at home, labouring population."[183] The editor also expressed his hopes that the association formed in Bombay with the leftover funds from the South African passive resistance movement would use that money to support the *Indian Emigrant*. Since "advocacy of equal rights of British Citizenship within the Empire forms one of the avowed objects of the Journal," the editor argued that the journal's purpose was in

[180] "An Excellent Scheme," *AC*, 28 September 1912; "Proposed Gokhale Institute," *AC*, 19 October 1912; "Money Refunded," *AC*, 23 November 1912.
[181] "The South African Fund," *Sansar*, 5 January 1914; "Indian Colonial Society," *Indian Emigrant*, 31 January 1916; A Hindu-Canadian, *India's Appeal to Canada or An Account of Hindu Immigration to the Dominion* (1915). The most famous example of this is *Indian Opinion*, whose editors and Gandhi received money for the passive resistance fund, which they also used to support the paper (see below).
[182] "Har Dayal Says Officials Cannot Now Deport Him," *Hindustanee*, April 1914.
[183] "Our Emigration Fund," *IE*, October 1914.

keeping with the South African fund.[184] Thus, newspapers' calls for donations for political movements were also often a call for money to keep the newspaper in operation, a fact that was sometimes, but not always, made clear to readers.

The most well-known and complex instance of this overlap between political leadership, newspaper ownership, and community fundraising arose in the case of Gandhi and *Indian Opinion*. *Indian Opinion* was never a self-supporting operation, but unlike other, more short-lived papers, it survived through copious and continual donations. Money for *Indian Opinion* was siphoned out of the passive resistance fund, often unbeknownst to donors. As de facto leader of the passive resistance movement, Gandhi was in charge of all donations received. Although exact numbers are difficult to obtain, the fund amounted to tens of thousands of pounds (see below). Much of this money went into *Indian Opinion*. In 1905, Gandhi moved the International Printing Press to Phoenix, where he planned to establish an autonomous ashram settlement that would run the printing press entirely by itself.[185] During the passive resistance movement, resisters and their families were housed at the ashram. Thus, donations included not only constant infusions of cash but also food, blankets, and clothing. These donations were funneled to the passive resisters, but also to the ashram settlement and *Indian Opinion* itself. Support for *Indian Opinion* also came directly from India as well as from South African Indian and European supporters. For instance, in December 1909, Ratan J. Tata sent a donation of Rs 25,000 to the passive resistance movement that "enabled it [*Indian Opinion*] to tide

[184] "Notes and Comments: The South African Indian Fund," *IE*, November 1914.
[185] "Manager's Notice," *IO*, 5 January 1905; *Ratepayers' Review*, quoted in "A Kindly Appreciation," *IO*, 21 January 1905.

over a crisis in its career."[186] Aiyar ruefully observed, "It is whispered in some quarters that…money is coming from India to support this work. Well, we do not know how it is with our esteemed contemporary Indian Opinion but if there is such a golden stream, we only wish that some of this beneficence would trickle our way; we could do with it and put it to good use."[187] In 1912, Gandhi acknowledged that when

> "eight years ago we migrated to Phoenix, the idea [was] that the workers might be able to look more on the land for their sustenance than to the proceeds of the sale of INDIAN OPINION and the advertisements inserted in it. During this period we have not given that attention to the land which it was thought we should be able to give, and we have certainly not been able to pay our way by means of agriculture. That the journal itself has not been self-supporting is a widely-known fact."[188]

In other words, the ashram solution was intended to support the journal's employees so that they would not require wages and the newspaper would become self-supporting through subscriptions and advertisements. However, neither the farm, the journal, nor its workers had become self-supporting. It was at this promising juncture that Gandhi decided to abolish advertisements, eliminating one remaining source of income and requiring the public to continue subsidizing *Indian Opinion*.[189]

By 1915 Gandhi recognized that *Indian Opinion* "has never been and *can never become* an entirely self-supporting proposition."[190] In order to be free from political and commercial entanglements and in order for *Indian Opinion* to pursue satyagraha without reference to public opinion, it would have to function separately from the pressures of the

---

[186] "Good News for Passive Resisters: A Gift of Rs. 25,000," *IO*, 4 December 1909; "A Princely Gift," 11 December 1909; "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912. By a sleight of hand, the 4 December 1909 article refers to Ratan Tata's donation "to the struggle" while the September 1912 article refers to Tata's "gift" as if it were intended solely for *Indian Opinion*. As is discussed below, this kind of silent re-allocation of funds was typical of Gandhi's management of the passive resistance movement.
[187] "Mightier than the Sword," *AC*, 26 August 1911.
[188] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912.
[189] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *IO*, 14 September 1912.
[190] Gandhi to Petit, quoted in "Passive resistance in South Africa: Mr. Gandhi's Statement," *AC*, 18 December 1915, italics added.

market. Gandhi embraced *IO*'s financial situation as emblematic of his skepticism of majority rule and capitalistic pressures. What was a financial necessity, he interpreted as spiritual improvement. However, this decision meant that *Indian Opinion ,* and by extension, Gandhi, were dependent for their success on others' labor and capital. Gandhi obscured this in a sleight of hand that presented *Indian Opinion* as an independent and yet representative institution. Infamously, Gandhi could not even run the printing press with labor from the settlers on the ashram as he originally intended. The hardest labor was done instead by four African women who remain unnamed in Millie Polak's memoir.[191] Thus, Gandhi's ideal autonomous newspaper, instead of arising organically from and perfectly representing an Indian community of satyagrahis, was continually dependent on cash, goods, and labor from merchants, lawyers, clerks, and impoverished African and Indian laborers whose participation in the capitalist world Gandhi professed to despise.[192]

Gandhi justified his use of passive resistance funds to subsidize Indian Opinion by insisting that *Indian Opinion* was the sole representative of South African Indian opinion. By registering the press and newspaper as a collective trust and by running the paper from his ashram, which was also the center of the passive resistance movement, Gandhi collapsed the distinctions between *Indian Opinion*, actual South African Indian opinion*s*, and collective political activism. This further blurred the lines between Gandhi the political leader, Gandhi the printer, and Gandhi the philosophical innovator and guru. Gandhi saw these roles as one. *Satyagraha* meant speaking and acting on one's individual interpretation of universal truth, and if one was right, others would necessarily follow.

[191] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 66-7.
[192] Swan, *Gandhi*; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 154.

This philosophy, however, ignores the power that Gandhi already held as the spokesman for the South African Indian community who was recognized not only by Gokhale and hence most of INC opinion, but also by the South African and imperial governments.

What Gandhi saw as unified philosophical-political practice, however, other South African Indians interpreted as sharp practices by a canny politician interested in promoting his own fame over others' welfare. Many critics questioned Gandhi's financing of *Indian Opinion* with passive resistance money. C. M. Pillay complained to the *African Chronicle* that when he was a boy he used to give money to organ grinders with monkeys and he didn't know if his money was for the music or "the antics of the money" and that the funding of the BIA reminds him of that "juvenile experience."[193] While criticizing the obscure finances of the BIA, Pillay also uses this analogy to compare the British Indian Association, and by extension, Gandhi, to performing monkeys and to imply that those who continue to follow Gandhi are just "juvenile" boys. This metaphor impugned the masculinity, and indeed, the humanity, of Gandhi and his followers, thereby undermining their claims to citizenship rights. At one public meeting, Habib Motan asked if it were true that £1,200 of the passive resistance fund had gone towards the Phoenix Newspaper Works and *Indian Opinion.* Gandhi acknowledged that passive resistance money had been spent on farm up-keep and improvements for Phoenix Settlement as well as on *Indian Opinion*.[194] However, Gandhi defended this policy on the grounds that the "'Indian Opinion' was a public Indian property—it was only nominally

[193] C. M. Pillay, "Gandhi-Gokhale Programme: Interesting Correspondence," *AC*, 5 July 1913. See also: "If our countrymen seriously care to uphold the rights of our motherland, they should with a discriminating judgment scrutinise the actions and policy of their leaders and follow as intelligent men, but not subject themselves to be led like cattle, not knowing where the leader leads to whether to Heaven or Hell. Ed. A. C." ("Correspondence," *AC*, 24 May 1913).
[194] "The Passive Resistance Funds: A Public Letter to Mr. Ratan Tata of Bombay," *IO*, 6 April 1912.

registered in his name. The money was expended on behalf of the public."[195] He argued that *Indian Opinion* was "a powerful weapon in the armoury of passive resistance….[and] in no sense a commercial enterprise."[196] Gandhi defended money spent on *Indian Opinion* as a legitimate political expenditure, since it was, according to him, *the* voice of "Indian opinion" in South Africa. Gandhi's critics, particularly rival editor P. S. Aiyar, objected to this position, claiming that *Indian Opinion* was a private operation that should be financed separately from the passive resistance movement.

By the end of Gandhi's time in South Africa, many former passive resisters, already dissatisfied with the outcome of the movement, were clamoring for an account of the monies raised and spent during the seven-year campaign. *African Chronicle* noted that Gokhale reported that India had sent £34,000 "and it would be interesting to know who has got all this money, and in what direction it has been spent. So far as we are aware, a very very [sic] small percentage was spent for the Indian strikers, we do not suppose it exceeded £1,000 all told, though it has been made out through the Indian Review by a writer that 2,0000 [sic] men were fed every day and that it cost £250 per day. It should be an instructive lesson at least to us if we can get details of the way £250 was spent every day."[197] Although Gandhi stated that nearly £3,000 was spent on relief for passive resisters' wives and children, including ongoing payments to widows and

[195] Gandhi, quoted in "No Compromise; Great Mass Meeting at Johannesburg: Mr. Gandhi in a Tight Corner: Declines to Accept Challenge to Hold Mass Meeting: Full Accounts Asked For: Chairman Rescues Him from Trouble: Strong Speeches against 'Settlement': Mr. Gandhi Explains: £200 Cable: A Resolution Urged," *Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in *IV*, 24 July 1914 and *AC*, 1 August 1914.
[196] Gandhi to Petit, quoted in "Passive resistance in South Africa: Mr. Gandhi's Statement," *AC*, 18 December 1915.
[197] "India's help for the South African Indian," *AC*, 18 April 1914. Another article stated that "Mother India" had sent Gandhi over £100,000 ("Indian Political Situation: A Dialogue: Imaginary and Real: Scene 1," *AC*, 4 July 1914).

orphans,[198] Aiyar published damaging stories about passive resisters who were in need of financial support but were rebuffed by Gandhi.[199] Similarly, *Indian Views* estimated the money raised from India as "fourty [sic] thousand odd pounds" and asserted that the strike did not cost more that £5,000. *Indian Views* laid the responsibility for this squarely at Gandhi's feet, saying that the South African Indian community "cannot and do not hold themselves responsible for the money and it emphatically repudiates all liability to account for same to the Indian public…[because]…so far as this fund was concerned…it was a 'one man' concern."[200] H. O. Ally, a former Gandhi supporter, particularly objected to Gandhi spending £200 on a cable to Bombay defending Gandhi's his to continue passive resistance in the face of Gokhale's objection.[201] The question of the proper use of print culture activism lay at the heart of the South African Indian debate over Gandhi's actions.

Gandhi seems to have repeatedly misappropriated funds, or at the very least made unilateral decisions to re-appropriate money from one public project to another. At one public meeting, Gandhi admitted that he had used money from the plague hospital fund for the passive resistance movement. Gandhi said that he "was unable to hold himself responsible to the public in connection with those funds; but even a child could come and

[198] Gandhi to Petit, quoted in "Passive resistance in South Africa: Mr. Gandhi's Statement," *AC*, 18 December 1915.
[199] "Notes & Comments: Unsympathetic Treatment of a Passive Resister," *AC*, 3 May 1913; "Correspondence," *AC*, 24 May 1913.
[200] "Passive Resistance Fund," *IV*, 31 July 1914.
[201] H. O. Ally, quoted in *Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in "No Compromise: Great Mass Meeting at Johannesburg: Mr. Gandhi in a Tight Corner: Declines to accept Challenge to hold mass meeting: Full accounts asked for: Chairman rescues him from trouble: Strong Speeches against 'Settlement': Mr. Gandhi Explains: £200 Cable," *AC*, 1 August 1914.

look at his public dealings."[202] By way of further explanation, Gandhi stated that he had published accounts periodically in the press and that there were three different funds instead of one large fund: "the anti Indian law fund, the passive resistance fund, and the funds from Bombay."[203] His intermittent accounting left much to be desired. For instance, R. J. Tata sent two donations of Rs. 25,000, one in 1909 and one in 1910.[204] Gandhi did not sent Tata an accounting of this money until April 1912 and then only for one of the donations. Money was spent on farm buildings for Phoenix, *Indian Opinion*, relief for indigent families of passive resisters, and other "self-explanatory" items. Gandhi wrote to Tata that the *Indian Opinion* costs were explained in a previous public letter to Gokhale and that Tata's money was used for Phoenix and *Indian Opinion* costs because funds from Rangoon, London, and some of the Bombay funds were earmarked for "entirely ear-marked for relief purposes."[205] Gandhi also noted that "the expenditures shown in the account takes no note of hundreds of pounds raised locally and disbursed by local committees, nor of private collections of which our countrymen will probably never know anything."[206] Although written in the vein of praise for these enterprising and struggling local passive resisters, one wonders why Gandhi felt no obligation to account for these funds in a more systematic matter.

---

[202] Gandhi, quoted in "No Compromise; Great Mass Meeting at Johannesburg: Mr. Gandhi in a Tight Corner: Declines to Accept Challenge to Hold Mass Meeting: Full Accounts Asked For: Chairman Rescues Him from Trouble: Strong Speeches against 'Settlement,'" *Rand Daily Mail*, quoted in *IV*, 24 July 1914.
[203] Gandhi, quoted in *Rand Daily Mail,* quoted in No Compromise: Great Mass Meeting at Johannesburg: Mr. Gandhi in a Tight Corner: Declines to accept Challenge to hold mass meeting: Full accounts asked for: Chairman rescues him from trouble: Strong Speeches against 'Settlement': Mr. Gandhi Explains," *AC*, 1 August 1914.
[204] "Good News for Passive Resisters: A Gift of Rs. 25,000," *IO*, 4 December 1909; "A Princely Gift," 11 December 1909; "More Passive Resistance Funds," *IO*, 10 December 1910; Ratan Tata to Gandhi, quoted in "Mr. Ratan Tata and Passive Resisters: Practical Sympathy and Keen Interest in the Struggle," *IO*, 17 December 1910.
[205] "The Passive Resistance Funds: A Public Letter to Mr. Ratan Tata of Bombay," *IO*, 6 April 1912. This does not seem to have put Tata off of donating to Gandhi, as he went on to be one of Gandhi's primary financial supporters upon Gandhi's return to India.
[206] "The Passive Resistance Funds: A Public Letter to Mr. Ratan Tata of Bombay," *IO*, 6 April 1912.

Later budgets were no more enlightening. Finally in 1915, Gandhi published an account of the funds, stating that passive resistance had raised £27,324, of which Bombay contributed £18,901, Madras £4,035, Rangoon £2,136, London £386, Nairobi £150, and Zanzibar £35. Contrary to Gandhi's accounting elsewhere, this only totals £25,643. Perhaps this discrepancy arose because the list of locations did not include donations from the US, Canada, Japan, and Indian Ocean islands, all of whom had contributed money. Total expenditure was £11,600, of which £2,868 was spent on relief, £2,251 on travelling, £1,080 on Johannesburg office, £1,068 on the Durban Office, £705 on telegrams and cables, and £400 on the London deputation. Of note here is that £2,853 were spent on office work and supplies and £2,657 on travel—together almost double what was dispense for the relief of passive resisters. Again, these amounts only totaled £8,732, leaving unexplained the details of how a remaining £3,428 was spent. Noticeably, this expenditure account failed to mention what was spent on the Phoenix Settlement and *Indian Opinion*. Gandhi further reported a balance of £15,724, of which he would return Rs 215,000 to Bombay political leaders. This left unexplained what was to be done with the remaining thousands of pounds.[207] Much of South African Indian opinion fumed, accusing Gandhi of misuse of funds to bolster his own folly and vanity.

As the conflict over the passive resistance fund shows, transnational activism and the "community" created by diasporic print culture were always fraught and challenging affairs. Supporters of a political movement might come together across vast distances, as did contributors to the passive resistance fund or volunteers in the Ghadr Party's army. At the same time, tensions ranging from the interpersonal to the communal to the political

[207] *AC*, 18 December 1915; Gandhi to Petit, quoted in "Passive resistance in South Africa: Mr. Gandhi's Statement," *AC*, 18 December 1915.

affected the breadth, depth, and longevity of these connections. If mishandled, transnational activism could easily turn acrimonious.

Conclusion

Activist-editors understood political literacy to be key to their claims to citizenship, and used their newspapers as a forum in which to foster political awareness and discussions. Editors aimed to inculcate political awareness amongst their readers in a time and place when most of their readers were disenfranchised. This chapter intentionally dealt jointly with the reproduction of government documents and the reporting of diasporic political activity (which historians have often categorized as nationalist or anti-colonial). This reflects editors' practice of reporting on politically and geographically far-flung documents and movements as a unified field of action. These periodicals re-imagined the imperial polity through the judicious summarizing and quoting of imperial and colonial documents interspersed with activist commentary. Thus, imperial print culture implicitly as well as explicitly expressed imperial citizenship. The next chapter explores the ways in which citizenship was practiced by readers as well as editors through direct engagement with the periodicals.

Chapter Five

Politics of Print: Literacy and the Boundaries of Citizenship

Disenfranchised Indians used addresses and petitions to government officials, as well as newspaper articles and letters to the editor, to create a form of participatory citizenship for themselves outside of the realm of voting rights. Citizenship emerged through print; not only in the discourse used to assert citizenship, but materially through participation in the different forms of print culture used to make those claims. As scholars such as Gauri Viswanathan have argued, the Raj used European literature to reinforce claims of British superiority and benevolence, presenting the British conquest of the subcontinent as part of a larger civilizing mission.[1] This civilizing mission implicitly promised Indian subjects access to what Milner called "white privileges" if they could demonstrate their qualifications to civility through dress, demeanor, and, crucially, education.[2] Meanwhile, in the settler colonies, English language acquisition was explicitly linked to citizenship through the imposition of language tests for immigration, trading licenses, and voting rights.[3] Literacy was—literally and metaphorically—a critical litmus test for citizenship. As a result, disenfranchised Indians were eager to display their English language skills and cultural literacy as evidence that they were fit

[1] Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989); Gauri Viswanathan, "Currying Favor: The Politics of British Educational and Cultural Policy in India, 1813-1854," in *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, eds. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 113-129; Meenakshi Sharma, "The Empire of English and its Legacy: A Citizenship of the mind," *Britishness, Identity and Citizenship: The View from Abroad*, eds. Catherine McGlynn, Andrew Mycock and James W. McAuley (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011).
[2] Alfred Milner to Secretary of State for the Colonies [henceforth SSC], 18 April 1904, TNA CO 291/70, Transvaal No. 16319.
[3] On the transnational circulation of literacy tests, see: Martens, "Transnational History"; Marilyn Lake, "From Mississippi to Melbourne via Natal: The Invention of the Literacy Test as a Technology of Racial Exclusion," in *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, eds. Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake (Canberra: ANU E Press, 2006); McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, 192-208; Lake and Reynolds, *Drawing*, 62-3, 146-8, 222.

for citizenship. Newspapers, books, and proper participation in political print culture were all evidence of diasporic Indians' capacity for citizenship. *How* one wrote was as important as *what* one wrote.

Editors used their papers to educate and direct the public in proper forms of political participation and political literacy. Readers' responses, however, often transformed proscriptive literature into cacophonous dispute, as participants in imperial print culture debated what forms political and print citizenship should take. These periodicals were sites of contention and negotiation, in which the meaning of empire and imperial citizenship was manifested through the very practices of print culture as well as through the printed words themselves.

Vernacular Citizenship: Language, Literacy, and Education

Education was central to citizenship claims. Because literacy requirements were often instituted as a gatekeeping device in immigration, citizenship, and trade licensing proceedings, political leaders urged their followers to be as educated as possible and celebrated any opportunity to demonstrate the educational qualifications of those they claimed to represent.[4] Polak published a case in which three Indian immigrants were deported from Natal on the grounds that they had not passed the education test, yet two were alumni of Baroda college (which, Polak's article noted, was known for its instruction in English). One of these individuals had also studied at Fergusson College, Poona and the other at Bombay University; the third was a telegraph operator for Indian

[4] Education qualifications were part of the evidence when the California Supreme Court ruled that Ganesh Pandit could become a US citizen because he "had succeeded in establishing beyond all reasonable doubt that he was a 'free white person' within the meaning of the Naturalisation Act" (*New India*, quoted in "Notes and News," *India*, 4 September 1914). However, a correspondent to *Indian Opinion* argued that the Cape Colony's test for European languages was an insult to Indian Universities (C. B. Shukla, "Correspondence: Indians at the Cape," *IO*, 14 April 1906).

Railways. Polak asserted that he spoke with them and all three were excellent English speakers. His article denounced "the fraudulent exclusion by the immigration authorities of the Indians."[5] Another *Indian Opinion* article excoriated the deportation of Harnam Singh from Canada, offering as proof of his worthiness the fact that he was ex-military and that he had started a school in Vancouver. The fact that he was deported in spite of these qualifications was evidence "'as to the British subject's being shorn of every semblance of Imperial citizenship, if he happens to be born in India.'"[6] Education was supposed to provide access to the rights of citizenship and activists objected particularly strenuously to racial discrimination against educated immigrants.

In order to encourage the education of Indian citizens, editors also reported on plans for local schools and libraries. These articles ranged from calls for donations, notice of new organizations and leaders, and fervent debates over the efficacy of these institutions.[7] *Indian Opinion* quoted from the Durban Indian Public Library's first quarterly report saying that it had 50 English and 40 Indian (Gujarati, Marathi, Hindi, Bengali, and Tamil) newspapers available and that it was open from 2 to 9 pm every day with electric lights and fans.[8] However, after some changes in personnel, a reader complained,

---

[5] "Indian Immigration," *AC*, 28 September 1912.
[6] "Position of British Indians in the Dominions: Memorandum by the India Office to the Imperial Conference: (Concluded)," *IO*, 7 October 1911. This was a direct quote from Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu, *Summary of the Hindu Question and its results in British Columbia presented by the Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu to the Empire as a Whole* (Victoria, May 1911).
[7] "Another Free School," *AC*, 7 May 1910; "Notice: Hindu Tamil Institution," *AC*, 7 March 1914; "City Schools," *AC*, 14 February 1902; *AC*, quoted in "A New School," *IO*, 1 May 1909; Sunder Singh, "The Hindu in Canada," *The Journal of Race Development* 7, no. 3 (January 1917): 378-80; "Tongaat Indian Library," *AC*, 2 April 1910; Bande Mataram [pseud.], "Notes and Comments: Library," *AC*, 26 February 1910; "Help! Help!!" *AC*, 2 April 1910; Narayanasamy, "Correspondence," *AC*, 15 April 1910; "Mahomedan Silver Library," *CIN*, 6 December 1901; "Indian Public Library," *IO*, 6 July 1907; "Items of Interest," *IO*, 30 September 1911.
[8] "Durban Indian Public Library," *IO*, 8 December 1906.

> "In Durban we have an Institution glorying in the name of the Durban Indian Public Library! It consists of two or three Magazines, several Indian newspapers (both the magazines and the newspapers are quite two or three months old), and a few books which are always kept under lock and key. The Librarian…has no knowledge of what a library is or how it should be conducted."[9]

He concluded by emphasizing that Durban Indians really needed a functional library since opportunities for education were so constrained. Educational institutions were to be praised, but also scrutinized, and everyone had different ideas of how education was best to be achieved.

The question of language education was particularly fraught. As diasporic citizens within the British empire, should Indians focus on acquiring English or should they embrace their heritage by learning their ancestors' vernaculars? *Indian Opinion* praised Hertzog's support for Afrikaans education and linked this to the strength of Afrikaner nationalism. Based on this example, *Indian Opinion* argued that Indian parents should reconsider their impulse to "Anglicise our children as if that was the best way of educating them or fitting them for real service to the Empire."[10] Vernacular education was particularly important for the interpretation of religious texts such as the Mharabharata and Ramayana, which the editor argued could not be learned properly through English translations.[11] Despite *IO*'s disapproval of the racist impact of Afrikaner nationalism, Gandhi also saw in their policies a model for Indian nationalism. Aiyar, however, despite his support for vernacular education, took issue with this article, arguing that to turn one's back on English was impractical and unscientific. Aiyar believed that "'The so-called Western civilization is the civilization of the future, and it

[9] Indo-Natalian [pseud.], "Correspondence: Indian Public Library," *IO*, 24 October 1908.
[10] "From the Editor's Chair: For Indian Parents," *IO*, 19 August 1911
[11] Ibid.

has borrowed largely from the East in days gone by."[12] Rather than rejecting English in favor of Indian languages, Aiyar instead sought connections between Indian and English "civilization" that drew implicitly on theories of Aryan heritage, framing the "future" of Western civilization in connection to India's "ancient" civilization. In keeping with this idea of a balance between "East" and "West," Aiyar generally supported vernacular education alongside English education. In an article helpfully entitled "Indian Vernaculars: How May It Be Taught," *African Chronicle* argued that English was necessary so that ruler and ruled could understand each other but that Indians should not learn English at the expense of their own languages. Aiyar suggested that head teachers should teach Hindi, Tamil, or Telugu at least twice a week after school.[13] He did not, however, provide suggestions as to where the resources for such an endeavour would come from.

What vernaculars should be taught was also a fraught issue, particularly in the South African context. At one meeting, protesters agreed that it was wrong that Indians paid for white schools while the government failed to provide Indian education. Gandhi proposed the establishment of an independent school teaching Gujarati and Urdu. Several speakers immediately objected to this plan, which neglected Tamil speakers who were often poorer and less educated than the Gujarati-speaking community. S. E. Hassim criticized Gandhi and other political leaders for neglecting to educate the ex-indentured Indians. Pointedly, he "reminded the leaders that they cannot be passive-resisters in this matter which is vital to the future of the race."[14] At this juncture, Gandhi and his

[12] "For Indian Parents," *AC*, 2 September 1911.
[13] "Indian Vernaculars: How May it be taught," *AC*, 20 May 1911.
[14] "Indian Education in the Transvaal: Enthusiastic Meeting: No Decision Arrived At: Special report to the African Chronicle: From our own correspondent," *AC*, 1 June 1912

supporters left the meeting, leaving behind only eleven members. Although these individuals pledged funds for the school, "no school committee was formed and no conclusion arrived at."[15] Although linguistic and communal differences could destroy educational and political movements, as in this case, religious and linguistic identities were also crucial in maintaining and encouraging vernacular education in diaspora. *Indian Opinion* published a letter from Ceylon asking South African Indians to send a memorial to London University to include Tamil as a language for study. *Indian Opinion* followed up the letter by urging educated Tamil speakers in South Africa to support the request and when the petition was rejected, urged them to try again.[16] The maintenance of vernacular education relied upon diasporic networks of teachers, printers, religious leaders, and activists. At the same time, conflicts and competition amongst vernaculars and between Indian language education and English education created divisions and dissent amongst Indian immigrants trying to calculate what language would provide access to the best future for themselves and their children.

Diasporic editors celebrated the educational qualifications of domiciled and colonial-born individuals.[17] *Indian Views* made education into part of a racial claim,

[15] Ibid. Later, Gandhi established a boarding school at Tolstoy Farm which taught in Gujarati, Hindi, and Tamil as well as English. Nonetheless, Gandhi acknowledged that "The Tamil tuition, I am sorry to say, is of a very elementary character, there being no good Tamil teacher available" ("The Passive Resistance Funds: A Public Letter to Mr. Ratan Tata of Bombay," *IO*, 6 April 1912).

[16] "Tamil in the London University," *IO*, 22 April 1905; "Tamil for London Matriculation," *IO*, 24 February 1906; letter from Registrar of University of London, reprinted in "Tamil for the University of London," *IO*, 24 February 1906.

[17] The educational qualifications of political leaders was particularly important. Several sources asserted that Sunder Singh had graduated from Oxford and had a medical degree (Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu, *Summary of the Hindu Question and its results in British Columbia presented by the Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu to the Empire as a Whole* (Victoria, May 1911); "Hindus in Canada: British Justice," *AC*, 2 December 1911). *Indian Opinion* testified that Gandhi was a student at London University and a barrister, while Haji Ojeer Ally had worked as a printer and clerk and supported female education ("The Personnel of the Deputation: Biographical Sketches," *IO*, 6 October 1906). *IO* also carried reports that Teja Singh was a graduate of Cambridge who was taking postgraduate classes at Columbia University

arguing that colonial-born Indians "revert to a higher type of civilization." As evidence of this, *Indian Views* stated that colonial-borns were stronger, prettier, and more intelligent than parents, that they go to universities in the US and that many converted to Christianity.[18] Announcements of individuals entering or graduating from college or postgraduate education were common. Graduates from English institutions were particularly lauded.[19] The Durban Indian Society held a reception for Joseph Royeppen upon his return from Cambridge. *African Chronicle* carried three articles on these receptions, noting that Royeppen was the first graduate of an English university among Colonial-born Indians and that he had been admitted to the English Bar.[20]

Those who had higher education were encouraged to use them for the benefit of the community—both to provide social and political uplift for the Indian diasporic community and to support colonial and imperial governments. K. D. Joshi, for example, wrote to *Indian Opinion* during the Bambatha Rebellion stating that as a graduate of Bombay Veterinary College, he volunteered to work as a veterinary surgeon for Natal's military.[21] Elsewhere, Gandhi apologized that the Indian community, while willing to volunteer for the army, lacked military experience.[22] Joshi's letter proved that Indians could offer not only enthusiasm but expertise to the colonial government. At the same time, the persecution of educated Indians was deemed even more reprehensible than

---

("Teja Singh: The Scholarly Gentle Sikh who has Solved the Hindu Problem of Canada; By Harold Franklin: [From Collier's Weekly]," *IO*, 8 May 1909 and 22 May 1909).

[18] "From Our Office Window," *IV*, 3 September 1915.

[19] "Successful Indian Lady Student," *IO*, 25 September 1909; "Mr. George Godfrey," *IO*, 5 October 1907; "Successful Colonials," *CIN*, 7 February 1902; "Another South African Indian Barrister," *IO*, 18 May 1907; "Items of Interest," *IO*, 13 April 1912.

[20] "Durban Indian Society," *AC*, 25 September 1909; "An 'At Home'" *AC*, 25 September 1909; "Reception to a Colonial-born Indian graduate," *AC*, 2 October 1909. See also: "University Man's Return," *IO*, 18 September 1909.

[21] K. D. Joshi, "Correspondence: An Offer of Services," *IO*, 23 June 1906.

[22] Gandhi to Colonial Secretary (Pietermaritzburg), 19 October 1899, NAB CSO 1632 9294/1899.

actions directed against less educated working-class populations. Royeppen's English education lent additional strength to his protests against anti-Indian legislation and poignancy to his participation in the passive resistance movement.[23] *Indian Opinion* and *African Chronicle* both published "before and after" pictures of Royeppen in his graduate's robes and as a passive resister in a street hawker's outfit as a way to emphasize the degradation of anti-Indian laws.[24]

Editors did not only report on evidence of education within the local community. African *Chronicle* published the "educational biographies" of two Indian students (not from South Africa) in the US.[25] *Indian Opinion* praised the radical nationalist Syamji Krishna Varma for establishing a scholarship of Rs. 2000 for two years of post-graduate study in Europe or the US.[26] Diasporic and subcontinental Indian achievements in literature and the sciences were celebrated.[27] These were interpreted as proof that Indians were civilized and capable of evidencing culture and education on par with Europeans. When H. H. Stevens asserted that Indian civilization had not produced anything worthwhile or good, the *Hindustanee* pointed to Rabindranath Tagore's recent Nobel Prize as counter-evidence.[28] Rahim pointed to the fact that there were "the millions of literati in the vernaculars; there are just as great men in politics, statesmanship, government, and other national virtues as the literati in English" as proof that Indians

[23] "Reflections of a Natal-born Indian," *IO*, 2 March 1907; "Passive Resistance New Recruits: Pass Unchallenged at the Border," *IO*, 25 December 1909; Joseph Royeppen, *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "What an Indian Barrister Says," *IO*, 18 December 1909; Royeppen, quoted in *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Progress of the Transvaal Struggle: Colonial-Borns Take Up the Cudgels," *IO*, 1 January 1910.
[24] "Items of Interest," *IO*, 28 May 1910; Ram [pseud.], "Correspondence: A Natal-Born Hero," *AC*, 2 April 1910; "Notes on Current Topics: By 'Observer": A Contrast," *AC*, 19 March 1910.
[25] Rafidian Ahmed, "Successful Indians Students in America," *AC*, 5 October 1912.
[26] "An Indian Philanthropist," *IO*, 3 June 1905.
[27] Sundara Raja, *Modern Review*, quoted in "Indian Students in England and the Continent," *AC*, 19 October 1912; "Indian Agriculture," *IO*, 20 June 1908.
[28] "H. H. Stevens, M.P., on Hindu Question," *Hindustanee*, January 1914.

were as, or more, civilized than Britons.[29] More specifically, *Indian Opinion* recommended that South Africans who desired to disenfranchise Indians should read A. Rangaswami Iyengar's book titled "The Indian Constitution," which was published by the *Hindu* office in Madras for Rs 2. Written and published by an Indian and defending ancient Indian practices of democracy, this book provided a double proof of Indians' educational and political qualifications for citizenship.

"The marrow of a nation's greatness": The newspaper as civilizational yardstick

Editors celebrated the publication of any and all documents by Indian presses, but the newspaper stood out as exceptional. Editors were particularly likely to take notice of Indian newspapers, published either in diaspora or in the subcontinent. The papers advertised or reviewed might be in English or Indian vernaculars. They ranged from explicitly political papers like *The Indian Sociologist* to religious papers like the *Hamdard Khalsa*.[30] *India* noted that "Vernacular journalism is making great progress in the Punjab. There are now no less than eight dailies published in Urdu at Lahore, five Hindu, three Moslem."[31] Crossing religious divides, these publications provided evidence of the growing Indian nation. These journals were welcomed, not just because they might espouse Indian nationalist ideas, but because their very existence was proof of Indians' education and literacy. Rather enviously, *Indian Opinion* observed that "San Francisco's Oriental newspapers are the wonder of the journalistic world. There are eight of them, all dailies—four Chinese and four Japanese. Each has its own building, a really metropolitan

[29] "Editorial," *Hindustanee*, February 1914.
[30] "General Notes," *CIN*, 16 August 1901; "Review of Books and Magazines," AC, 12 December 1908; "An Indian Philanthropist," *IO*, 3 June 1905; "A Review of the Yugantar of last month," *Ghadr*, 18 February 1914, translation enclosed in Malcolm Reid to H. H Stevens, 26 January 1914, VCA SP 509-D-7 file 1; "A Review of 'The Hindustanee [sic] Student'," *Hindustanee*, April 1914.
[31] "Notes and News," *India*, 8 May 1914. See also: "Newspapers in Bengal," *India*, 8 August 1913.

staff of reporters and writers, and an editor whose sense of news values is as acute and up-to-date as the average American's."[32] An "up-to-date" editor and a full staff of reporters were luxuries that no small diasporic papers like *Indian Opinion* could afford. Like Japan's military might and nationalist fervor, the San Francisco "Oriental" newspapers were proof of that diasporic community's strength, a beacon for Indians to aspire to.

Editors argued that the newspaper was not only a necessary political tool, but also a herald of civilization. At the founding of the International Printing Press, its owner Madanjit Viyavaharik stated, "'We have all believed a printing press to be a necessity amongst us. No civilised community can do without it.'"[33] In Canada, Kartar Singh "impressed upon the South Asians…that 'no group or nation can fully advance without its paper.'"[34] A correspondent named "True Imperialist" wrote that he was happy to see *Indian Opinion* because "as a champion of the oppressed and victimised, the newspaper stands alone…Newspapers it is told are forerunners of civilisation. They form in themselves mediums of social and political progress."[35]

Aiyar echoed this idea in much greater detail in the first issue of *Colonial Indian News*. Aiyar began with the "romantic history" of "the art of printing" from the ancient Chinese to Gutenberg's press through the "science and mechanical ingenuity" that characterized modern printing. Aiyar argued that printing, by expanding literacy, had been "an untold boon to the human race. The progress of the world, the elevation of the poor, the strides of civilization and the general prosperity of the nations all have their

[32] "Items of Interest," *IO*, 9 July 1910.
[33] Quoted in Isabel Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 47; Desai and Vahed, *South African Gandhi*, 67.
[34] Hans, "Punjabi Press," 886.
[35] True Imperialist [pseud.], "Correspondence," *IO*, 9 July 1903.

origin in the advantages derived from printing." Since "Education forms the marrow of a nations [sic] greatness" and printing put information and education "into the hands of even the poorest, so as to enable them to rise from their surroundings and to become good citizens and useful members of society," printing was directly related to individual citizenship and national strength. According to Aiyar,

> "The Newspaper enterprise is so closely identified with the art of printing, that it can be said with justification that the two ventures are inseparable…What is true of printing is undeniably and substantially true of its crowning achievement, namely, the Newspaper. The Newspaper is the voice of the people and the chief mainstay of a country's wealth, prosperity and greatness. The liberty of the press has long been one of the most cherished principles of British citzenship [sic]. It is the Magna Charta of both the rich and the poor, the oppressed and the victimised…Indeed its [the country's] very progress is gauged by the kind and amount of newspaper enterprise…It forms the grandest and sublimest [sic] ideals of the elements of a true and progressive civilization… Cowper writes thus on the newspaper:--'Tis [sic] pleasant through the loop holes of retreat/ To peep at such a world; to see the stir/ Of the great Babel, and not feel the crowd/ To hear the roar she sends through all her gates/ At safe distance, where the dying sound/ Falls a soft murmur on the uninjured ear.'"[36]

Using several keywords (liberty, justice, fair play) that spoke to the myth that the British empire spread these values to the rest of the world, Aiyar moved from printing as a global medium to the newspaper as a specifically British achievement. Invoking English legal documents (the Magna Charta) and English literature (William Cowper's poetry), Aiyar presented the newspaper, and specifically, his newspaper, as part of a larger British cultural legacy. The newspaper was a universal "Magna Charta," representing specifically English legal and political principles as the rightful inheritance of any community with a newspaper. Aiyar's repetition of the term "progress" evoked popular political and

[36] "The Newspaper Press," *CIN*, 18 May 1901.

"scientific" theories that races and nations evolved in stages of civilization. With the publication of *Colonial Indian News*, Aiyar was demonstrating Indians' collective arrival at British levels of civilization. For disenfranchised Indians, having a newspaper was critical to their claims of citizenship, not just because of what the newspaper advocated, but because of what the newspaper symbolized: the community's capacity for educated and informed (British) citizenship.

Images of imperial citizenship

The imagery of imperial citizenship was depicted most elaborately in addresses intended for government officials or prominent Indian political leaders. Chapter four argued that the language and circulation of these addresses was intended to emphasize the petitioners' status as diasporic and imperial subjects. This section picks up that analysis and argues that this was symbolically depicted in the imagery surrounding these addresses. This imagery explicitly depicted the simultaneity and multiplicity of diasporic Indians allegiances: they were both imperial and transnational, at once Indian, British, and colonial. For example, the Natal Indians' illuminated address for Edward VII's coronation was

> "emblazoned in proper heraldic colours, with a groundwork outline of India over the text. A miniature view of the Indian arch erected in West Street on the occasion of the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York very properly heads the inscription. In each of the lower corner openings are medallions representing a wounded officer being watched over by a member of the Indian Ambulance Corps, who is depicted with clenched hands and a fixed determination to stand by his charge. The other emblem represents a Bengal officer charging. Over the large initial 'E' is depicted the Star of India, with the motto, 'Heaven's light our guide.' The text and ornamentation are enclosed by a cut-out mount covered in figured silk tapestry plaited round the miniatures, and further enhanced by suitable velvet hangings looped and corded in a

> tasteful manner, the whole being encased in a massive English gold frame of chaste design and finish."[37]

These carefully chosen images evoked India, England, and South Africa as interlacing parts of an imperial whole. West Street, the center of the Indian neighborhood of Durban, headed the document, with the West Street arch recalling yet another occasion on which South African Indians had celebrated the royal family, in this case, Edward's son, the Duke of York (future George V). Evidence of more active loyalty was pictured in the Indian Ambulance Corps, volunteers who cared for colonial soldiers who were wounded in the Anglo-Boer War. The empire-wide role of the Indian army was figured in the Bengal officer. Over the entire text lay the outline of the subcontinent and in the text itself, the Star of India surmounted Edward's first initial. In this imagery, Edward was literally crowned by India, with divine providence ("Heaven's light") protecting him, embodied by the fiscal and military support of South African Indians.[38] These explicitly Indian pictures were surrounded by more subtle English imagery and materials: the heraldic colors of the Royal Family across the entire work and a "massive" frame of "English gold" surrounding the address.

A more explicitly Indian Ocean/South African Indian imagery was produced by the Veda Dharma Sabha and Hindu Young Men's Association of Pietermaritzburg in their address of welcome to Lord Buxton, the new Governor-General of South Africa. This address was illuminated with the symbol of "Hind Deir [sic] (Mother India)" standing on the Indian Ocean and holding a trident as if to protect India from the King's foes, along with Natal's Coat of Arms and motto "Ex Umtate Vires" and India's Coat of

[37] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Address of Natal Indians," *CIN*, 30 May 1902.
[38] The Star of India and "heaven's light our guide" were the symbol and motto of the chivalric order of the Star of INdia, founded by Queen Victoria in 1861.

Arms with "Heaven's light our guide." The entire address was enclosed in a silver cylinder with the Union Jack engraved on it.[39] In this address, India is the protector of the Indian Ocean, while India and Natal were highlighted as part of the Indian Ocean, the British empire and Britain itself. Likewise, passive resisters presented colonial supporter William Hosken with an address illuminated with a "rich ornamental border with the map of India at one end and that of South Africa at the other. The address was enclosed in a solid silver cylinder with the ends richly ornamented. The cylinder rested horizontally on two silver uprights fixed to polished South African wood."[40] These addresses were framed between India and South Africa, highlighting their creators' diasporic and imperial existence. An address presented to Gokhale merged imagery and texts referencing India, England, and the Cape Colony.

> "The address is a very artistic production, and contains many points of interest…A map of India, faintly outlined, is brought out distinctly by the underlining of the text. In addition to a portrait of the recipient, the border has, in the top corners, heads of elephants, caparisoned in scarlet and gold, while the five-pointed star, backed by the 'Sunburst,' the badge of the Order of the Indian Empire, figures on each side, the one being scrolled with the motto 'Heaven's Light our Guide' in English, and in Sanscrit [sic] on the other. The bottom corners are occupied by the arms, on shields, of the Cape and Bombay provinces, the latter being the recipient's native Presidency. Mounted with a purple ribbon, the address is handsomely framed in dark carved wood, each corner embellished with the Star of India in silver, with a gilt star in relief."[41]

Combining African and Indian imagery, this address contained a map of India and (African or Indian?) elephants. The specifically *imperial* dimensions of India were represented in the repeated Star of India motif, and the sunburst badge of the Order of the Indian Empire (in which Gokhale was a CIE), as well as by the heraldic arms of the

[39] "Indian Community's Address to Lord Buxton," *AC*, 3 July 1915.
[40] "Successful banquet in Johannesburg: In honour of Mr. Hosken and His Committee," *IO*, 17 June 1911.
[41] *Cape Times*, quoted in "Kimberley Report (cont'd)," *IO*, 2 November 1912.

Bombay province. Text in English and Sanskrit framed the Order of the Indian Empire, while South Africa appeared in the heraldic badge of the Cape Colony. Gandhi presented Gokhale with another address which was

> "extraordinarily beautiful and elaborate. It took the form of a solid gold plate representing a map of India and Ceylon, engraved with the text of the address, and bearing at the foot the facsimile signatures of the President and Secretary. The map was flanked on either side by two gold tablets, one bearing an illustration of the famous Taj Mahal and the other a characteristic Indian scene. The whole was mounted on Rhodesian teak, set in an elaborately carved frame of polished South African wood, and enclosed in a velvet-lined casket of Rhodesian teak."[42]

Here, Indian images underpinned South African Indian words, which in turn rested on South African materials. Likewise, Zanzibari Indians presented Gokhale with an address that was quite unique to Zanzibar Indian traditions. This address was enclosed in a carved solid gold casket made from sixty-four melted sovereigns and mounted on elephants carved from East African ivory which stood on an ebony base.[43] Again, the elephant (symbol of both Africa and India) appeared, but here made out of East Coast ivory and wood and British coins named for the monarch. Images of Indian animals, including elephants and peacocks, were common, along with lotus plants and maps of India, while religious organizations decorated with Muslim or Hindu motifs.[44]

The images and motifs engraved or embossed on these exceptional documents was part of a larger visual vocabulary that celebrated Indian immigrants' existence between empire and nations. The discourse of imperial citizenship was textual, but it existed in more than just words. The images, languages (literally), and general

[42] *Transvaal Leader*, quoted in "A Round of Receptions: Johannesburg Greets Mr. Gokhale in Right Royal Style," *IO*, 9 November 1912.
[43] "Hon. Mr. Gokhale at Zanzibar: From Our Own correspondent," *IO*, 28 December 1912.
[44] "Address to Lord Roberts: From Our Special correspondent," *IO*, 19 November 1904; "Indian Presentation to Lord Selborne: From Our Special Correspondent, Johannesburg," *IO*, 10 June 1905; *Transvaal Leader*, quoted in "A Round of Receptions: Johannesburg Greets Mr. Gokhale in Right Royal Style," *IO*, 9 November 1912.

appearance of these documents all testified to diasporic Indians' membership in a transnational empire.

I have quoted at length from descriptions of these addresses in order to underscore how important they were in diasporic-imperial print culture. Through newspaper descriptions, these addresses re-circulated multiple times and far beyond their initial audience. Editors deemed these addresses important enough to reproduce, not only the text, but descriptions of their physical appearance that took up several columns or even pages in their papers. Significant time, energy, and money was invested, not just in the initial production, but in the reproduction of these documents for a wider audience to appreciate. The resources spent on making the address were publicly recognized and re-iterated by the expenditure of more resources to describe them. The address, in effect, "appeared" twice over, while the significance of its imagery was driven home to readers of a much broader Indian imperial diasporic community as well as to the official recipient.

The proof's in the production value: the art and politics of printing

The physical production of these addresses was itself a matter of great import. As the description of these "elaborate and costly" addresses makes clear, no expense was spared in the production of this and similar documents.[45] Committees were formed to organize subscriptions in order to subsidize the cost of these productions, which could be considerable.[46] Important addresses were engraved in or decorated with gold and silver

[45] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Address of Natal Indians," *CIN*, 30 May 1902.
[46] *CIN*, 4 October 1901; "Mr. Polak and the Deportees: What Durban is Doing to Receive Them," *IO*, 24 September 1910; "Transvaal Notes," *IO*, 15 October 1910; "Mr. Gokhale's Visit: Durban Reception Committee," *IO*, 21 September 1912.

and enclosed in cases of worked wood, velvet, silk, and other materials.[47] This served as a testament to the wealth and importance of the senders, as well as evidence of their loyalty.

Addresses given to Indian and white supporters were frequently less elaborate than those presented to colonial officials, with those given to monarchs the most ornate. Aiyar describes the BIA's address to Gokhale as being simply "a plate of gold, cut in the shape of the Indian peninsula…[which] was nailed to a frame of oak, the whole being enclosed in a case."[48] Likewise, one of the addresses that Polak received was in "a little brown leather pocket-case with a silver plate fixed to it."[49] Although these both still used precious metals, the description indicates a less elaborate production than documents intended for monarchs or Governor-Generals. Nonetheless, these addresses still received plenty of attention and care. *Indian Opinion* specified that "The lettering [on Polak's address] is very fine and delicate" while *African Chronicle* described Gokhale's address as "a wonderful work of art."[50]

The money required to produce such monuments was part of their purpose. These addresses demonstrated the wealth and education of the citizens who produced them and their decorations formed an integral part of the political message they carried. This is made clear in the case of the committee formed to create a welcome banquet and address for Polak and the deported passive resisters. The committee insisted that only subscribers

[47] "The Thanks of the People: Addresses to Messrs. Ritch and Polak," *IO*, 22 October 1910; "Mr. Gokhale in Durban," *IO*, 16 November 1912; "Lord Selborne on Trek: The British Indian Question: His Lordship's Views: Addresses at Rustenberg, Klerksdorp, Potchefstroom and Krugersdorp: Klerksdorp Chamber of Commerce and Asiatics: (Specially Reported for 'Indian Opinion')," *IO*, 14 October 1905.
[48] "Reception to Hon. Gokhale," *AC*, 9 November 1912.
[49] "Welcome to Mr. Polak and the Passive Resisters: A Unique Address: 600 Signatories," *IO*, 8 October 1910.
[50] "Welcome to Mr. Polak and the Passive Resisters: A Unique Address: 600 Signatories," *IO*, 8 October 1910; "Reception to Hon. Gokhale," *AC,* 9 November 1912.

could sign the address, restricting the expression of gratitude to those who were both literate and monied.[51] Moreover, they decided that the money collected should be spend first on the address, second on room and board for passive resisters in Durban, and the remainder given to passive resistance fund.[52] In other words, the creation of a suitably elaborate address was more important than funding the well-being of activists who had already lost months of their life to the lengthy process of resistance, deportation to India, and return to South Africa. This decision seems absurd and slightly obscene, unless one takes textual production seriously as a political action. Activist leaders clearly believed the creation of illuminated addresses to be a crucial part of their political strategy, more deserving of funding even than direct action by passive resisters. Printing was political.

Sometimes, newspapers remarked on the incongruity of spending money on such sumptuous presents, particularly when given to passive resisters who followed Gandhi's ideals of poverty and simplicity. For instance, the tone of an *Indian Opinion* article on the reception given to Kallenbach teeters between bemused and condescending. Despite Kallenbach's desire to slip away unnoticed to Europe, Indian activists ran to meet his train. There they gave him an illuminated address in a silver casket, as well as the works of Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin in a silver mounted case.

> "The idea was incongruous enough. Mr. Kallenbach, who had given up most of his luxuries…to be presented with a solid silver casket! Where was he to keep it? That was no concern of the enthusiastic admirers. So the address was illuminated and a silver casket ordered and

[51] "Mr. Polak and the Deportees: What Durban is Doing to Receive Them," *IO*, 24 September 1910. The address eventually contained over 600 signatures ("Welcome to Mr. Polak and the Passive Resisters: A Unique Address: 600 Signatories," *IO*, 8 October 1910).

[52] "Mr. Polak and the Deportees: What Durban is Doing to Receive Them," *IO*, 24 September 1910. At the end of the day, *Indian Opinion*'s accounting registered a total £60 14s 6d, of which £19 0s 10d was spent on stationery, telegrams, board and lodging, provisions, and hire of chairs and £41 13s 8d given to passive resistance fund. So the bulk of the money was spent on the passive resistance movement rather than on stationery, board, and lodging. However, this may not account for the cost of the address ("Durban Passive Resister's Reception Committee," *IO*, 22 October 1910).

> prepared…Passive resistance (love) and picketing were once more triumphant…We understand that Mr. Kallenbach does not intend to keep the address and the casket himself, but will hand them to his sister in Germany."[53]

The article acknowledged the irony of a member of Gandhi's ashram accepting the luxuries of silver casket and illuminated manuscript while espousing a politics of self-knowledge through self-denial. The passive resisters who bestow these gifts on Kallenbach are depicted as slightly ridiculous, importunate, even inconsiderate in their lack of "concern" for Kallenbach's preferences. They bring the antagonistic politics of picketing and passive resistance to bear on their reluctant ally, yet the article also acknowledges that this is "love." In the ultimate irony, passive resistance is triumphant, but only for a moment. Kallenbach momentarily accepts the gifts, but only with the intention of leaving them to someone unrelated to the passive resistance struggle. This article raises the uncomfortable question of the value and even the desirability of such expensive and ornate physical monuments of gratitude to political activists. Although Kallenbach represented a challenge to the mode of Indian activists' expressions of gratitude, the concerns in this article are the same as those in articles wondering if the address to the king is elaborate enough. Both were concerned with the *proper* mode of expression. The definition of what was proper was inverted in the face of Kallenbach's (and Gandhi's) philosophy of simplicity. The concerns with propriety as expressed through the forms of print culture remain the same.

The physical appearance of documents, including use of font, correct grammar, and the appropriate form of address, were all considered evidence of respectability, education, and standing as a substantial citizen. Descriptions of addresses often praised

[53] Apparently he was willing to keep the books and their silver case ("Reception to Mr. Kallenbach: A Hearty Send-Off from Johannesburg," *IO*, 5 August 1911).

their "chaste" lettering, engraving, or printing and "suitable" or "proper" inscriptions.[54] The *Natal Mercury*, while disagreeing with *Indian Opinion*'s politics, nonetheless wrote, "We congratulate the proprietors of the INDIAN OPINION upon the improved appearance of their newspaper. In its present form it is altogether attractive, and the type is large and distinct…There is always something well worth reading in the English language, but we must admit our inability to criticise what is written in Gujarati, Hindi, and Tamil."[55] The fact that this notice only appeared in 1905 suggests that the *IO*'s appearance was generally *not* pleasing in its early years. Similarly, *Natal Advertiser* praised *Indian Views* for being "exceedingly well printed and turned out [which] reflects credit on the Union Printing Press" although the lack of an introduction meant that the political intentions of the paper remained opaque.[56] Even editor-printers who competed for jobs and subscriptions would congratulate rivals on the pleasing appearance of their printed work. The editor of *Indian Views*, who founded his paper with the express intention of criticizing Gandhi's policies, nonetheless praised the *Indian Opinion*'s Golden Number memorializing the passive resistance movement. *Indian Views* deemed it "an excellent publication. The letter press, the photos and whole got up [sic] are A. 1…. the 'Golden Number,' is a worthy record of a great movement. We must, however, qualify the above assertion by adding that some faces which ought to have found a place in the portrait gallery are missing and this fact we impute to littleness of mind."[57] Anglia

[54] "Address to Lord Roberts: From Our Special Correspondent," *IO*, 19 November 1904; *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Address of Natal Indians," *CIN*, 30 May 1902; "Indian Presentation to Lord Selborne: From Our Special Correspondent, Johannesburg," *IO*, 10 June 1905; "Lord Selborne on Trek: The British Indian Question: His Lordship's Views: Addresses at Rustenberg, Klerksdorp, Potchefstroom and Krugersdorp: Klerksdorp Chamber of Commerce and Asiatics: (Specially Reported for 'Indian Opinion')," *IO*, 14 October 1905.
[55] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Ourselves," *IO*, 28 January 1905.
[56] *Natal Advertiser*, quoted in "As Others See Us," *IV*, 10 July 1914.
[57] "Golden Number of 'Indian Opinion'" *IV*, 11 December 1914.

felt compelled to compliment *Indian Opinion* on the physical production of the "Golden Number" celebrating the passive resistance movement, even as he resented Gandhi's interpretation of the movement. *Indian Opinion* praised the *Aryan*, saying, "There is something attractive about this little journal. The cover is printed in back [sic] and red and there are no advertisements." Perhaps Gandhi recognized a kindred spirit in Sunder Singh's devotion to "to the spread of the Eastern view of Truth; the interests of the Hindus in the British Dominions; and the causes of the present unrest in India' and his decision to publish a paper without advertisements.[58] What made the paper "attractive" was both its politics and its printing. *Indian Opinion* likewise hailed a new Indian weekly in Madras with "We congratulate our contemporary on its appearance…There is always room for a good paper."[59] A "good paper" was one which was beautifully produced as well as containing interesting or relevant material.

"Why can't the English teach their children how to speak?"[60]: Racial politics and the etiquette of writing

Many editors saw their role as that of educator and director of public opinion. *Ghadr* told its readers, "Through the medium of the Mutiny we will show you every week the true state of affairs. Read this paper carefully and explain it to your uneducated brothers. In this way you will be able to help the people in India soon."[61] Editors worried about inappropriate or unseemly political action. Aiyar opposed Gandhi's inclusion of

[58] "Indians in British Columbia," *IO*, 2 December 1911. Aiyar also praised *Aryan* as a "well got up paper" "Canada and Asiatic Immigration," *AC*, 20 July 1912.
[59] "Facts and Comments," *IO*, 22 April 1905. See also praise for the *South African Jewish Chronicle*'s Rosh Hashanah edition ("Our Jewish contemporary," *IO*, 26 September 1908).
[60] Alan Jay Lerner, "Why Can't the English?" *My Fair Lady* (1964). Adapted from Bernard Shaw's commentary on language, class, and social mobility at the turn of the century. "The English have no respect for their language, and will not teach their children to speak it" (Bernard Shaw "Preface," *Pygmalion* (1912) http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3825/3825-h/3825-h.htm).
[61] "Those in Favor of the Government," *Ghadr*, VII and VIII, n.d., translation enclosed in Reid to Stevens, 30 December 1913, VCA HP 509-D-7 file 1, Microfilm Reel M-3.

indentured laborers in the passive resistance movement of 1913. He argued, first, that the passive resistance movement was originally about another set of concerns and that adding the £3 tax to the movement's claims was unfair; second, that indentured Indians, having signed a contract, were bound by the terms of that contract, no matter how unfair; and third, that legal redress could only be achieved through constitutional agitation rather than continuing and extending the unrest spread by the passive resistance movement.[62] When the indentured Indians at the Dundee coal mines attacked a magistrate, Aiyar leapt to condemn this action. He dismissed this as the actions of a "handful of thoughtless, ignorant and foolish labourers" whose behavior "is entirely foreign to the national instincts of and traditions of our [Indian] countrymen." The article closed by reminding readers that "insubordination and a tendency to lawlessness will not enhance the progress of our cause."[63] *African Chronicle*'s Mossdale correspondent described the strike as "absurd" and unworthy of a "so called civilised area."[64] In an editorial, Aiyar decried "strike mania…and all similar violent remedies." He insisted that "The first duty of every civilised person [is] the observance of law and order." Reversing his earlier position in support of passive resistance, Aiyar asked his readers, "how is it possible to expect any self-respecting ministry to give in to other than constitutional pressure…Should we fail in our duty to uphold the prestige and maintain the dignity of the government…how is it possible to expect any justice from them[?]"[65] Essentially, Aiyar argued that if Indians were going to claim to be citizens alongside white settlers, they had to demonstrate that they were thoroughly imbued with middle-class British values of legality, decorum, and

[62] "From the Editor's chair: The True Position of £3 Tax Payers," *AC*, 8 November 1913.
[63] "From the Editor's Chair: Our Sincere Regret," *AC*, 1 November 1913.
[64] *AC*, 1 November 1913. See also "the stupidity of acting like fanatic [sic]'" (Mossdale [psued.], quoted in "Progress of Passive Resistance," *AC,* 8 November 1913.
[65] "From the Editor's Chair: The True Position of £3 Tax Payers," *AC*, 8 November 1913.

respect for authority. Aiyar worried that the strike undermined these claims.[66] K. R. Nayanah agreed, writing in a letter to the *Natal Mercury* that "since we have made this country ours and our children's home, we shall cease to be men if we take up an attitude which is not calculated to procinct [sic] harmony and foster good feeling with the Europeans of this country.'"[67] For Nayanah, the strike was proving indentured Indians to be neither men nor desirable citizens, in direct contrast to what colonial-born Indians wanted to achieve. Likewise, *The Pioneer* "condemn[ed] the childish practice,"[68] deeming public, illiterate, and semi-violent practices of resistance to be unmanly or childlike and therefore unworthy of citizenship rights. Meanwhile, they continued to insist that "dignified", conciliatory, and educated protests would receive proper recognition from governmental authorities and white settlers alike.

Editors worried about illiterate Indians being "mislead" by political leaders with whom they disagreed and undertook to direct readers and others how to act in such cases. In an article sarcastically entitled "Our Benevolent Advisers," *The Hindustanee* instructed its readers not to sign the petition being circulated by Miss Crook, a missionary. Although the petition was in favor of allowing Indian wives and families into the country, *Hindustanee* objected to Miss Crook as "an undesirable ally…never before known to the Hindustanees."[69] *Hindustanee* cautioned its readers against taking

[66] That Gandhi shared this last concern is evidenced by his attempts to limit the indentured Indians' strike to certain pre-approved groups and by his letters to Smuts asking Smuts to concede rather than risk the danger of an uprising by indentured workers (Gandhi to E. H. L. Gorges, 28 September 1913, SAB GG Volume 897 15/489).
[67] K. R. Nayanah, *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Progress of Passive Resistance," *AC,* 8 November 1913. The next week, Aiyar's editorial reported that European supporters of the journal have declined to give their support now that Indians are striking ("From The Editor's Chair: Our Present Position," *AC*, 15 November 1913).
[68] *Pioneer*, quoted in Rueter (Bombay), quoted in telegram (London, 21 November), quoted in "Indian Strike: From the *Natal Mercury*," *AC*, 29 November 1913.
[69] "Our Benevolent Advisers," *Hindustanee*, 1 May 1914.

directions from activists outside the community. In an even more direct attempt to maintain total control, Gandhi wrote that *Indian Opinion* should "Let the people be warned that they should…sign no other documents unless they were from us."[70] This "protected" *Indian Opinion* readers not only against anti-Asiatic politicians but also against other Indian activists, like Aiyar and the CBIA, who might disagree with Gandhi. Similarly, Aiyar warned his readers, particularly coolies, not to sign a petition being circulated in favor of the Land Appropriation Bill. "[T]he Coolies must vigilantly watch those who call for signature in any document, and if they, without understanding the contents of the document, sign their names or cause to be signed, they will be betraying their own ignorance and stupidity, and will eventually be playing into the hands of the enemy."[71] Although this column masquerades as advice, it condemns and mocks indentured Indians' "ignorance and stupidity" which would "betray" not only their own lack of education but their more educated countrymen. Gandhi, Aiyar, Singh, and others often took a condescending tone towards their readers or towards the illiterate Indian population whom they claimed to represent.

Editors undertook to train their readers to behave like respectable citizens, particularly in regards to how they wrote and addressed political documents. Editors provided quite specific instructions on how such documents were to be produced, how much they should cost, and what they should look like. As argued above, addresses to the imperial officials and prominent political leaders were a crucial performative component of Indian loyalty. As such, the form as well as the content of these addresses was a matter for public concern. Before Gokhale's visit to South Africa, the General Reception

[70] Gandhi to H. S. L. Polak, n.d, BL MS EUR B272/1909.
[71] "Land Appropriation Bill and Cooly [sic] Supporters," *CIN*, 30 August 1902.

Committee informed readers of *Indian Opinion* that all addresses must be submitted for approval one week before presentation and that the addresses would then be presented according to the GRC's schedule for Gokhale's visit.[72] This was part and parcel of what Aiyar characterized as the "invidious restriction imposed on his [Gokhale's] movement" during his visit. [73] Although Aiyar and others objected, Gandhi's interest in controlling the language and appearance of the addresses presented to Gokhale was different only in degree from other editors' attempts to instruct their readership on proper print citizenship.

Editors reproved readers when they considered the community remiss in some duty of (print) citizenship. Four months before King Edward VII's coronation, Aiyar chided his readers for not preparing an address for the occasion.[74] Four weeks later, Aiyar copied the *Natal Mercury*'s description of the illuminated address presented from Natal Indians to the King-Emperor, noting that although it was "executed….at short notice…[it] will probably bear favourable comparison with any other example of its kind at the forthcoming Coronation celebration."[75] It is not certain that this address was a result of Aiyar's editorial, but the fact that it was produced "at short notice" suggests that this was likely. Aiyar was not only upset that Indians had not donated money for an address, he was particularly distressed by their willingness to raise money for other activities that he considered less suitable. According to Aiyar:

> "It is very unfortunate that the city Indians have yet taken no steps to present an address in a suitable manner to His Majesty on the occasion of the Coronation…this is a most unique occasion to manifest their sincere attachment and loyal devotion to the throne of England…When they, without feeling any inconvenience, raise huge subscriptions for

[72] "Mr. Gokhale's Visit," *IO*, 19 October 1912.
[73] "A Puzzling Problem," *AC*, 9 November 1912. See also: P. S. Aiyar, "My Impressions of Mr. Gokhale," *AC*, 15 November 1912.
[74] "A Word to the City Indians," *CIN*, 2 May 1902.
[75] *Natal Mercury*, quoted in "Address of the Natal Indians," *CIN*, 30 May 1902.

> celebrating wretched things like tom-toming [sic] Mohurrums [sic], and others of that kind, we cannot see why they could not exhert [sic] their endeavours to an object which…would raise them very high in the estimation of their fellow-colonists."[76]

This was part of a larger campaign against Muharraham celebrations. Although Muharraham is a Muslim holiday celebrated with feasts, parades, and music, many indentured immigrants began celebrating it regardless of their religion. White settlers objected to the noise produced during the celebration.[77] Elite Indians like Aiyar responded to these complaints, arguing that while Muslims might be justified in their celebrations, Hindu and Christian indentured Indians should refrain, as the noise that they produced was without religious justification and became a civil nuisance.[78] In this case, Aiyar contrasted noisy and uncouth Muharraham celebrations, which reinforced white settler claims that Indians were undesirable citizens, with donating money for an address to the king, which, he believed, would be recognized by white colonists as evidence of Indians' fellow citizenship. Money spent on low-class and indecorous religious celebrations was a bad kind of civic participation, which Aiyar contrasted with donations for dignified, literate demonstrations of a British political celebration.

These critiques rested on the unspoken understanding that literacy skills were interpreted through racial and civilizational lenses. The ability to write "properly" carried class, gender, and racial connotations. For Indians, as for other colonial subjects, learning English language, literature, and culture was key to achieving recognition from British

---

[76] "A Word to the City Indians," *CIN*, 2 May 1902.
[77] Minute Paper regarding the annoyance caused to residents in Bellair by the celebration of the Mohurrum festival 1890, NAB CSO 1466/1896 2903/1896; Minute Paper "regarding the complain by the inhabitants of Bellair of the intolerable nuisance inflicted upon their nights during the period of the Indian Mohurrum [sic]" 1894, NAB CSO Minute Papers 1466/1896, 3590/1894.
[78] Goolam Vahed, "Constructions of Community and Identity among Indians in Colonial Natal, 1860-1910: The Role of the Muharram Festival," *The Journal of African History* 43, no. 1 (2002): 77-93. See also: Hindu Young Men Association resolution, quoted in "Indian Poll-Tax," *AC*, 22 January 1910; J. M. Lazarus, "Maritzburg News: From Our own Correspondent," *AC*, 18 January 1913.

rulers. Many Britons believed Macaulay's claim that there was more value in one bookshelf of British books than in the entire literature of the subcontinent.[79] Indian writing was scrutinized and criticized in gendered and racialized terms, as effeminate, overly ornate, and purely imitative. The term "babu" was appropriated by Britons to mock educated Indians, whom they believed to be inferior writers and thinkers.[80] Even Indian printers' work was stereotyped as too effeminate and elaborate.[81] The implications of this played out in the subcontinent and in diaspora, with Indian authors, editors, and activists constantly monitoring themselves and each other for signs of "Oriental" excess or other indications that their writing was unfit for British standards. *Colonial Indian News* carried a leading article of three columns on Curzon's reforms requiring more brevity in reports from Raj officials. *Colonial Indian News* echoed the Anglo-Indian newspapers' praise for a recent report from the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, which, at five-and-a-half lines, was "a master-piece of condensation and and [sic] should be circulated throughout the district of every province as an illustration of precisely what is wanted."[82] Another observer claimed that Curzon's reforms might influence European officials but "the pen of the ready writer is in the hand of the native head clerk, whose notes of Pennellian [sic] length are the wonder of his juniors and the envy of his less successful contemporaries in the provincial secretariat."[83] Although the length of official

[79] Thomas Babington Macaulay, "Minute on Indian Education," (2 February 1835), http://www.mssu.edu/projectsouthasia/history/primarydocs/education/Macaulay001.htm, accessed 29 June 2016.
[80] Rajiv M. Vrudhula, *The Bengalee babu: Ideology, stereotype and the quest for authenticity in colonial South Asian literature* (PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1999) http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/304541611/fulltextPDF/B82441F944EA4C8DPQ/1?accountid=14553; Banerjee, *Make me a Man!* 29; Viswanathan, *Masks*, 159-60.
[81] Hofmeyr, *Gandhi's Printing Press*, 38-9.
[82] Unnamed Indian paper, quoted in "Lord Curzon's Razor," *CIN*, 6 September 1901. Ironically, *Colonial Indian News* took up three columns of a leading article on the subject.
[83] Ibid.

documents was a product of imperial bureaucracy, some interpreted such prolixity as an inherently racial quality of the Indian "native." A few years later, *African Chronicle* reported that "the negro papers and periodicals…were full of eulogistic personal notices, generally accompanied by photographs. This fondness for display indicates another characteristic—that of extravagance."[84] Certainly, as seen in chapter three, Indians had no desire to be classed with Africans or African-Americans. Clearly, Aiyar believed that they would have to monitor each other's writing to make sure that no such inappropriate "effusions" were permitted. Rather than simply being cosmetic quibbles, these criticisms reflected real concern over the perception of Indian correspondents' fitness for citizenship.[85]

Editors were particularly concerned with readers' participation in print culture forms of citizenship, such as petitions and letters to the editor. The *Hindustanee* warned its readers against Miss Crook's petition, describing it as "a tried and discarded method of petition, a queer blank form which had nothing thereon excepting the words: ['](1) For the moral safety of the country. (2) For humanity's sake. (3) For the honor of the Empire.['] Not one word bearing on us."[86] *Hindustanee* objected to Miss Crook's choice of words, which focused on the empire and white settlers' concerns rather than on the experiences of Indians. They also criticized the medium and appearance of her petition as "queer" and ineffective. The substance and the form of her politics were equally objectionable. Likewise, Aiyar censured a Natal Indian Congress petition because it was addressed to the Governor-General, whereas "on a question of so vital importance as that

[84] "The Coloured Question: An Interesting lecture by Mr. Maurice Evans," *AC*, 15 March 1913.
[85] Irina Spector-Marks, "The Indians' Own Magna Carta Britishness and Imperial Citizenship in Diasporic Print Culture, 1900-1914," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 16, no. 3 (December 2015).
[86] "Our Benevolent Advisers," *Hindustanee*, May 1914.

of the Coolies, the memorial in question ought to have been addressed to the Secretary of State for Colonies."[87] Gandhi's condemnation of a Colonial-Born Indian Association petition to the Licensing Officer was much more severe. Although he agreed to reprint the petition in *Indian Opinion*, he prefaced it with following disclaimer:

> "We publish the foregoing crude document at the express wish of the senders. To dignify a letter addressed to a departmental official as a 'petition' is hardly self-respecting. People petition Governors, Ministers, and such like, but not their under-officials…If the manner of presenting the complaint of our Colonial-born friends is so open to objection, the subject-matter itself is doubly so. It hardly becomes them to seek for special privileges…Are the Colonial-born children of Indian parents born in India to claim rights higher than the latter? We do hope that those who are responsible for the unfortunate 'petition ' will reconsider their views. We refuse to believe that they represent the feeling of the majority of the Colonial-born Indians.—Ed. I.O."

Gandhi followed criticism of the address of the petition with an objection to the political ideas contained therein. In each of these cases, a civics education for readers went hand-in-hand with condemnation of political rivals.

It was not only editors who undertook to police community members' activities and tone. Correspondents and special contributors regularly debated editors' dictums. In the case of the CBIA petition, Nayanah was quick to criticize Gandhi's print etiquette, writing to *Indian Opinion* that:

> "To call a Petition crude, and not say in what respects it is so, is surely not 'Cricket.' As you say, the Petition is published 'at the express wish of the senders,' it would have been as well for you, in fairness to the senders, to have added that…though you refused to publish the Petition without making adverse comments, the senders were not averse to your doings [sic] so…If you still persist in saying that you refuse to believe they represent the feeling of the majority of Colonial-born Indians, the senders are prepared to afford you an opportunity to prove your statement, instead of your sheltering under generalisations...If it be admitted, as you do, that the claims of Colonial-born Indians, ought to be specially considered, why

[87] "Land Appropriation Bill and Cooly [sic] Supporters," *CIN*, 30 August 1902.

> should one entitled to make the claims, not advance them. Is it wrong to ask for that to which one is entitled?"[88]

In concert with established patterns, Nayanah began by criticizing Gandhi's form. While Gandhi condemned the CBIA petition as "crude", Nayanah attacked it as un-British through the rhetoric of "cricket". Both accusations served to diminish the citizenship claims of those under attack. Nayanah then proceeded to school Gandhi on a more appropriate method of publishing a document with which he disagreed. Also like Gandhi, Nayanah transitioned from presentation to subject matter, defending the claim of colonial-born Indians to special rights and pointing out that Gandhi himself agreed with this premise. Gandhi followed Nayanah's letter with the this riposte:

> "When the whole petition appears to us to be crude, we do not consider it worth while to say more…If the 'petition' represents the opinion of all or the majority of Colonial-born Indians, which we still doubt, we shall indeed feel sorry. There are, undoubtedly, rights which we may accept if given to us, but which we dare not advance. The separate rights claimed by our Colonial-born friends, in our opinion, fall under the category of such rights.—Ed. I.O."[89]

Reiterating his assertion that the petition was "crude," Gandhi defended his right to attack the petition without providing specific instances and then further argued his position that colonial-born Indians might be due special rights but that they could not ask for them. Throughout this entire exchange, as with Aiyar's criticism of the NIC petition and Rahim's criticism of Miss Crook's petition, it was clear that form and content were inextricably intertwined.

In one drawn-out saga, Aiyar originally refused to publish a letter from a correspondent, John Henry Baynes, on the grounds that while the editor agreed with the

[88] K. R. Nayanah, "Correspondence: The Colonial Born 'Petition,'" *IO*, 11 May 1912.
[89] "Correspondence: The Colonial born 'Petition,'" *IO*, 11 May 1912.

content, the sentiments were ill-expressed.[90] Baynes retaliated by publishing an open letter to the Editor of the *Colonial Indian News*. *Colonial Indian News* responded with this attack:

> "it is to be regrtted [sic] that a letter having for its object the exposure of the grievances of the coloured population of this Colony should appear in the form in which it appeared. Whet ho [sic—when the] manuscript was first submitted to us for publication in the columns of the Colonial Indian News, we rejected it because it was so worded that no Journal having the air of decency and respectability would stoop to print such stuff in its columns…we were, though aggrieved to see so much sterling and useful truth wasted in a labyrinth of virulent invectives and incorrigible style, compelled to reject it…By using the high-flown and intemperate language of faddists the agitators could not affect the situation of the power holding class…in giving expression to it [truth] one needs the tact, judgment, moderation and politeness of a skilfull [sic] politician."[91]

Aiyar contrasted his newspaper's "decency and respectability" with the "virulent invectives," "incorrigible style," and "intemperate language of…agitators." Politics and the mode of their expression here go hand in hand, both disqualifying Baynes from being taken seriously by real "skilful politician[s]." Aiyar offered to publish Baynes' article if he gave "full permission to boil it down" but if not, then Aiyar would charge Baynes for publication as an advertisement "according to our rates."[92] Baynes responded that he would not allow Aiyar to edit his letter "because every line of the letter in question is worth £1,000" (although he clearly also declined to pay Aiyar's rates for advertisements—his article may have been worth thousands of pounds but Baynes was not). Baynes further explained that his letter could "be reduced to half the size by leaving out explanations which the smart scholar educated man can fill in himself. But then I am

[90] This is possibly the John Henry Baynes of Johannesburg who in 1931 described himself as a European with a Cape Coloured wife and who supported South African trade with Japan (Richard Bradshaw and James Ransdell, "Anti-Asian Agitation in South Africa in the 1930s: Reaction to the 'Japanese Treaty' and 'Honorary White' Status," *Southeast Review of Asian Studies* 32 (2010): 14.
[91] "Mr. Baynes' Open Letter," *CIN*, 14 February 1902.
[92] "Reply to Correspondents," *AC*, 14 February 1902.

not writing for the benefit of the enlightened man, no[,] sir[,] I am writing for the schooling of the unschooled."[93] What Aiyar derided as "incorrigible" and "intemperate" prolixity, Baynes defended on the grounds that lengthy exposition was necessary to enlighten the uneducated population, the very working-class and indentured audience that Aiyar himself claimed to represent.

In the next issue, Aiyar capitulated and published Baynes' letter criticizing the Governor of Natal.[94] Immediately after publication, both Aiyar and Baynes faced numerous recriminations from readers. Like Aiyar, these readers objected to Baynes' extremist views, but they criticized primarily through the rubric of grammar and spelling as evidence of the author's lack of respectability, class, education, and even sanity. "A Subscriber" wrote, "I as a subscriber to your valuable paper naturally object on principle to the monopoly of space by Mr. John Henry Baynes who is palpably ignorant."[95] Here, A Subscriber connected the money he pays for the paper ("I as a subscriber") to the worth of Aiyar's paper ("valuable" functions here both as praise for the paper and as an indication of the money that A Subscriber provides and that Aiyar requires for the paper's continued publication). Ostensibly a compliment for *Colonial Indian News*, A Subscriber's objection to Baynes' monopolization of space implies that Aiyar may find himself without "a subscriber" if he continues to privilege such writing. This was not an empty threat, as Aiyar repeatedly publicized his struggles to collect enough subscriptions to keep the paper afloat.[96] A Subscriber further attacked Baynes: "His English is of the worst and betrays the class of person he is…the fanatical manner in which he attacks the

[93] John Henry Baynes, "Reply to 'A Subscriber," *CIN*, 21 February 1902.
[94] John Henry Baynes, "Protest against his Excellency's Policy," *CIN*, 28 February 1902.
[95] A Subscriber [pseud.], "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 7 March 1902.
[96] See chapter one.

Governor of Natal, not only goes to point out his unworthiness as a citizen but more forcibly proves how traitorous at heart he is…I hope and trust that in future when he does attempt to air his feelings he will get someone who thoroughly understands English and can write grammatically to do it for him."[97] The accusation that Baynes was an unworthy or traitorous citizen was sandwiched between attacks on his English language skills. A Subscriber used Baynes' grammar and vocabulary to demonstrate, not only his low-class status, but his unfitness for citizenship.

Aiyar tried to stem the tide by concluding A Subscriber's letter with the declaration that "[Correspondence on the above must now cease] [Ed. C. I. N.]" but two issues later, he was publishing more correspondence on the topic.[98] A letter from Joseph P. Ehrhard echoed and expanded on A Subscriber's criticisms.[99] Ehrhard wrote that it was a "struggle" for him to read Baynes' letter. He supported Aiyar's initial decision to refuse to publish Baynes' letter, surmising that Aiyar

> "has, naturally a fellow-eelings [sic] for the compositors on his staff and I am positive that his humane principles alone compelled him to refuse publication to such a meaningless effusion. I can assure you it was trying enough for me to *read* it, but if the fates decree that I should ever commit such execrable trash to print, then I hope to be sensible enough to know that there are more ways of shuffling off this moral coil than by being tortured to death in such a manner. Probably the compositors on the 'C.I. News' also share my opinion."[100]

This defense of Aiyar constituted a further attack on Baynes. According to Ehrhard the bad grammar and vocabulary of Baynes' epistle negated the political sense of it, making it a "meaningless" piece of "execrable trash." To print such a piece would be akin to

[97] A Subscriber [pseud.], "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 7 March 1902.
[98] A Subscriber [pseud.], "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 7 March 1902.
[99] Ehrhard's letter was introduced by a letter from J. P. Stanley, a white man who recommended Ehrhard to Aiyar as an educated Coloured man who was "championing qeuality [sic] of citizenship and political rights" (John Stapley, "Coloured Question: Criticism on Mr. Baynes' Open Letter," *CIN*, 21 Mach 1902).
[100] Joseph P. Ehrhard to J. P. Stanley (11 March 1902) quoted in "Coloured Question: Criticism on Mr. Baynes' Open Letter," *CIN*, 21 March 1902.

torture for any educated, respectable Indian, such as Aiyar's compositors. Ehrhard included evidence of his own English literacy by casually including a quotation from Hamlet in his attack.[101] Ehrhard contrasted his own literacy and respectability, as well as that of Aiyar and his compositors, with Baynes' poor writing and radical politics.

Although Ehrhard agreed with Baynes' description of the state of the coloured population, he claimed that Baynes' English was atrocious and his claim to represent the coloured community was "unauthorized." Himself a Coloured man, Ehrhard suggested that authorities should have Baynes committed to a lunatic asylum because when ill-educated people like Baynes spoke on behalf of the coloured community it undermined their position. While A Subscriber tried to disenfranchise Baynes by declaring him to be an unfit citizen, Ehrhard advocated (if only in jest) that Baynes lose his freedom entirely through imprisonment in an insane asylum. The stakes surrounding seemingly trivial points of grammar, vocabulary, and mode of expression were tied to deadly serious questions of who deserved the rights of citizenship or indeed of personhood.

As this material shows, as much as editors tried to use their newspaper as a tool of didacticism and policing, the papers often ended up instead being a site of multiple voices and contesting viewpoints. By encouraging political discussions, editors opened the door to dissent and disruption, inadvertently offering a space in which contributors, far from demonstrating one type of model citizenship, fiercely competed with each other over what form(s) of citizenship would in fact look like. In doing so, they created a participatory citizenship in and through print culture.

Proscription and cacophony

[101] See chapter one for more instances of Shakespeare being cited by colonial subjects to prove their civilization, education, capacity for citizenship, or participation in the imperial sphere.

Editors were not above using their papers as a forum in which to attack rival editors. As activist-editors, these confrontations frequently combined disagreements over political methods and goals with competition for readers' subscriptions. These two motivations were not unrelated. If editors saw themselves as the political educators of the public and their papers as the training ground for readers' citizenship, then readers who subscribed to other newspapers with different politics were in danger of mis-education and faulty citizenship. Rahim wrote in the *Hindustanee*:

> "Many enquiries have been made of us concerning the Sansar of Victoria, B. C., the official organ of the 'Great Illusion' or 'Maya,' but as this eccentric publication, as far as we knew, had been discontinued during the past few months, we thought the fag had disappeared, and did not care to flog a dead horse, as we consider space in this sheet too valuable for this purpose. As a cheeky beggar 'The Sansar' has however, been inspired to raise its head above the waters last month, and the next thing is its begging for the neat little sum of $2,000."

The article further explained that *Sansar* had originally been established by the Khalsa Diwan Society and the United India League, with Sunder Singh as its editor. However, "the 'Sansar' bug…evolved so fast" that the press and land on it which operated were claimed by Singh as his sole property. Comparing Singh to a disease or voracious parasite consuming and destroying the body politic, the article objected to Singh's politics as well as his business practices. Rahim especially resented the misstatement by the Canadian press that Singh was a leader of the Indian community. According to Rahim, "he [Singh] is just leading himself, by himself, and for himself…The Hindustanees of Canada have a solidarity which is unique, and the few solitary individuals like Dr. Sunder Singh, by the grace of the conservative 'politicals [sic]' of Canada, are making frantic efforts to disturb it." The Khalsa Diwan and the UIL worried that the re-appearance of the Sansar "might bewilder the Hindustanees out of

Canada…and hence this note of warning."[102] While Rahim's beef was with a local rival, editors also criticized papers from distant locations. *Ghadr* condemned all the mainstream Punjabi newspapers, saying,

> "All Indian papers are cowardly but those of the Punjab excel all others in this respect. Instead of exposing the treatment which Hindus in Canada and the U.S. are subjected to, they add to their sufferings. This is true of the Tribune, Punjabi Desh, Paisa, Loyal Gazette, Khalsa Advocate and other fully. The Khalsa Advocate shamefully abused Har Dyal [sic], Bhagwan Singh and others who faithfully served their country…These papers by their false reports, poison the minds of the people and promote slavery and cowardice."[103]

Just as editors warned their readers what political projects they should support, they also cautioned readers against those papers they considered to be politically and morally corrupt.

In South Africa, competition and political disagreements between newspapers often sundered along linguistic divisions. *Indian Views* informed its English readers that the Gujarati columns of *Indian Opinion* advised readers not to register their marriages, even though this was one of the requirements of the Indian Relief Bill of 1914. After offering a translation of the Gujarati extracts, *Indian Views* wrote, "So we have the astounding fact from Mr. Gandhi's organ that the Relief Act is a farce…While he does not say a word about it in the English portion and goes about singing the virtues of the new Act he gives it out in Gujerati [sic], the language of the Mohammedan, that they must not on any account register their marriages!"[104] While Anglia spoke both Gujarati and English, and was therefore in a better position to catch Gandhi's prevarications, Aiyar often struggled against his inability to access Gandhi's Gujarati columns, while at

[102] "The Sansar," *Hindustanee*, June 1914.
[103] Translation, *Ghadr*, 8 December 1915, LAC Department of the Secretary of State, Chief Press Censor, 1915-1920, RG6-E, Volume 579 File 251.
[104] "The Marriage Question," *IV*, 17 July 1914.

the same time criticizing *Indian Opinion* for failing to serve the Tamil-speaking community.[105] Although Aiyar did not speak Gujarati himself, he made sure to find supporters who could translate for him when necessary. During a dispute between Gandhi and Aiyar over whether they should testify before the Commission of Enquiry, *African Chronicle* reported,

> "A correspondent informs us that, in the Gujarati columns of the *Indian Opinion* there appears an article attacking and ridiculing Mr. P. S. Aiyar, the editor of this journal…We do not know what this paper writes about us, nor do we care to know about it since the *Indian Opinion* represents Gandhi & Co. Ltd., who have proved themselves an avowed enemy of ourselves, since the inception of this journal, and therefore we have decided to pass the hostile criticism they make with contempt. However, since it is the right of our readers to know the nature of the evidence which Mr. P. S. Aiyar, of this journal has given, we publish below a verbatim report of it and we leave it to our readers to form their own judgment."[106]

Clearly, editors published important and critical material in different languages in order to strategically reach certain populations and not others. At the same time, editors were sensitive to these linguistic-political divisions and so on the alert for communal or individual insults.

Class and religious divisions also impacted newspaper competition, sometimes erupting in violent rhetoric. During World War I, *Indian Opinion* published an article on Turkish and Algerian Muslim soldiers. *Indian Views* interpreted this as a religiously-motivated attack by a Hindu paper against Muslims.

> "This brutal attack by our ethical contemporary has its explanation in the fact that this catchpenny stands for Hindu ideals which per se we see no harm in…This biased paper does not stop at expressing disgust only at our

[105] *Indian Opinion* ran a Tamil column for two years, but the material was always very small and not written by Gandhi. In the 1920s, Aiyar briefly tried to produce a Gujarati column for his readers, but this was also short-lived and characterized by insufficient information ("Publisher's Notice," *AC*, 28 November 1921).
[106] "The Indian Commission: Mr. P. S. Aiyar's Evidence: Full Report," *AC*, 21 February 1914. See also: "Last Sunday's Meeting: Great Confusion: Nothing Done," *AC*, 18 October 1913.

> Turco's exploit, but goes on to say that the ethical and racial culture of the Hindus (with whom we have no quarrel)…is vastly superior to that of the Turcos. Vastly superior in deed! If sutteeism [sic]and infanticidism [sic] be evidence of a vastly superior ethical and racial culture then our contemporary takes the cake."[107]

Despite saying that they had not quarrel with Hindus or Hindu ideals, *Indian Views* retaliated with an attack on supposedly Hindu-specific practices of widow-burning and infanticide. They then associated these practices with *Indian Opinion* itself. As much as editors called for political unity, they also used language, religious, and class differences to accentuate and express political difference between competing papers.

South African Indian opponents of Gandhi particularly objected to his use of *Indian Opinion* to publicize not only his politics but his person and philosophy. C. M. Pillay wrote that the passage of the Immigration Restriction Bill

> "has afforded 'Grand Lama Gandhi of Tolstoy Farm,' one of those timely opportunities to puff himself and his immediate entourage…His biography was written by Messrs I. B. Meyer, Mehta, Natesan, and Doke, at sixpence per copy. To keep him continuously before the public limelight a certain portion of the money contributed by the Indian public for the passive resistance movement was invested in the 'Indian Opinion.' His frugal fare consisting of grapes and monkey nuts; the wearing of an exaggerated pair of trousers by his disciple Kallenbach, the owner of Tolstoy Farm, were as ostentatiously advertised as any new brand of soap, pills, or whiskey.[108]

Gandhi's politics, publications, diet, and clothing are all here interpreted as manifestations of his desire for the limelight. Pillay depicted *Indian Opinion*, *Hind Swaraj*, and Doke's biography of Gandhi as extended "advertisements" for the Gandhi "brand." *Indian Views* echoed this assessment, asserting that Gandhi was "no more [modest] than fop Brummell was. He does not so much care as to the intrinsic value of

[107] "Our Ethical Contemporary," *IV*, 20 November 1914.
[108] C. M. Pillay, "Gandhi-Gokhale Programme: Interesting Correspondence," *AC*, 5 July 1913.

the work which he does [as] to its appearance in print."[109] Earlier, in opposing Gandhi's decision to include indentured Indians in the passive resistance movement, *African Chronicle* observed that "Mr. Gandhi may have been a good man prior to his assuming the roll [sic] of a saint, but since he attained this new stage by himself without being ordained by a holy preceptor, he seems to be indifferent…to human sufferings and human defects."[110] Pillay describing Gandhi as South African Indians' "evil gonius [sic]," insisting that it was Gandhi's megalomania that imprisoned South African Indians in the failed passive resistance movement.[111] Both Aiyar and Pillay criticized Gandhi's attempts to combine the roles of philosophical and political leader, arguing that this combination made Gandhi an ineffective and cruel leader who endangered the community. Aiyar also objected to Gandhi's vilification of those Indians who "wont [sic] pay homage to his saintly honour."[112] Gandhi's erstwhile followers came to see him as a careless and vain political leader who was more interested in promoting himself than in his followers' well-being.

At the conclusion of the passive resistance movement, Aiyar vented his frustration at Gandhi through a dialogue "Imaginary and Real." This took place between Gandhi and a number of Indian and British interlocutors, including Mother India, John Bull, "Mahomed" (representing Muslim merchants), "Christie the Colonial" (representing the colonial-born population), "Sammy" and the "Tanjore Coolie" (representing indentured Indians) and the real historical figures of General Smuts, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, and Sir

[109] *IV*, 11 December 1914.
[110] "Dear Mr. Gandhi's Letters," *AC*, 10 January 1914. See also: "Hitherto the people of India were somewhat overtrustful [sic] of the 'man on the spot' who is too spiritual to trouble about political problems" ("Notes & Comments: The Other Side," *AC,* 1 March 1913.
[111] C. M. Pillay, "Gandhi-Gokhale Programme: Interesting Correspondence," *AC*, 5 July 1913.
[112] "From the Editor's Chair: Indian enquiry Commission," *AC*, 28 March 1914.

Pherozeshah Mehta. The dialogue took up the three full pages in *African Chronicle* and contained three scenes. Throughout, Gandhi's spiritual and political claims were greeted with scorn. "Christie the Colonial" told Gandhi: "I know we cant [sic] be deported, but we may be made to starve here and live like animals. Do you want us to lead this life? Is this the much vaunted concession you have obtained for us?" Gandhi replied, "You, Colonials, have always been very insolent and impertinent in your behaviour towards big people. You must not talk to me like that. Dont [sic] you know I have become a world-renowned man." Christie replied that if Gandhi had become a "big man" it was through colonial-borns' activism and cursed Gandhi into purgatory.[113] Similarly, when Gandhi admonished "Sammy" the indentured Indian: "Don't talk to me like that, you Coolie. Don't you know I am a big man?", Sammy replied, "I know you are a Koss [sic], but I want you to clear my doubts" and cursed Gandhi in the name of Shiva.[114] In this scene, all classes of South African Indian society joined together to repudiate Gandhi

Aiyar then imagined Gandhi being criticized upon his arrival in India. This imaginary scene detailed Gandhi's reception by the denizens of Bombay:

> "Gandhi: Ladies and Gentlemen, I am fatigued by this long tedious journey from London, though I have been sustaining myself on monkey-nuts and lemon squash (interruption: You eat saucepans of rice and scores of bread.) Moreover, as you are aware, I have given up my life to India and I have abandoned the transient pleasures of this world also (Interruption, nonsense cries) and am more or less devoting all my attention to search Divinity. (Have you given up agnosticism?) However brief the account may be, trust me, and everything is settled once and for ever [sic] in South Africa (murmur and dissent from the crowd)."[115]

Aiyar saw Gandhi's dietary restrictions as a disingenuous publicity stunt and imagined an angry and disillusioned reception for him in India, rather than the

[113] "Indian Political Situation: A Dialogue: Imaginary and Real: Scene 1," *AC*, 4 July 1914.
[114] Ibid.
[115] "Indian Political Situation: A Dialogue: Imaginary and Real: Scene III. Bombay," *AC*, 4 July 1914.

triumphal return that Gandhi himself hoped for. In this imaginary scene, the citizens of Bombay agreed with Aiyar that it was the "self-aggrandising [sic] policy of Mr. Gandhi and his cosmopolitan followers that wrought the ruin of the Colonial-born interests."[116] In the dénouement of this scene, Mehta told Gandhi:

> "'you ruined India, in order to make for yourself the name of martyr and statesman in South Africa, and now you have come back here, after ruining the Community there, with a cock and bull story, and appeal to us to trust you. You deserve no mercy.' (Cries of 'Down with the Traitor.') Turning to the citizens of Bombay, Sir Perazsha [sic] Metha [sic] vehemently denounces this creature, and calls upon the audience to hang him straight away. The citizens, infuriated beyond control, rallied round the platform, curse, denounce, hurl anathemas, and some throw chairs, sticks, rotten eggs, stinking fish, etc. and some other [sic] spit on his face…Thereupon he repairs to his palatial mansion in his native village, and leads his so-called retired life."

After which Sir John Bull accuses Gandhi, "You surrendered my brightest jewel India, caused restlessness, you ruined the South African Indians, and caused no end of trouble to my Empire, all for nothing. I order you to clear out of my coutnry [sic] at once, and join the kingdom of Beelzubab [sic]. Thereupon a number of Tommies appear on the scene and dispatch him for ever."[117] By 1914, Aiyar's anger at Gandhi was such that he gleefully envisioned a scene in which Gandhi was thoroughly shamed and injured before a nationalist mob in the subcontinent, was denounced by both Mother India and John Bull, the figures of Indian and British nationalism, and was ultimately executed as a traitor by the British Raj! In this prolonged denunciation of Gandhi, Aiyar repeatedly highlighted three related accusations: that Gandhi's spiritualism was false, that Gandhi put his own vanity before the welfare of the South African Indian community, and that Gandhi's combination of spiritual and political leadership was the reason why he failed.

[116] "From the Editor's Chair: Indian enquiry Commission," *AC*, 28 March 1914.
[117] "Indian Political Situation: A Dialogue: Imaginary and Real: Scene III. Bombay," *AC*, 4 July 1914.

Editors invited reader participation through correspondence columns but also by asking readers to contribute news items and opinion pieces. This strategy was in part a response to the labor shortages that editors faced. Unable to pay a staff of reporters, editors hoped to use readers' contributions to bulk out the material on offer. At the same time, this call for contributions also had the effect of including readers in a community. In an editorial "To Our Readers," *African Chronicle* noted,

> "We feel sure that there are many incidents of public interest constantly occurring which never reach the newspapers…We invite our readers to send us reports or short articles interesting to the Indian community, to reach this office not later than Wednesdays. This Journal has an increasingly large circulation and in many homes is the only paper read. The Editor invites short snappy reports of sports in all its branches, Secy's [sic] of clubs will oblige by forwarding list of fixtures &c., to reach this office not later than Wednesdays."[118]

Leaving the topic and format open to readers, Aiyar asked readers to contribute raw material or polished articles. Moving beyond the strictly political, this invitation asked readers to contribute material relevant to the Indian community, including reports on social clubs, sports events, and religious organizations. Likewise, Singh asked readers of the *Aryan*, "WILL our readers kindly send in to this paper brief notes of interest from their localities? We desire to make this publication a true newspaper, with all news fresh and up-to-date, and to do this we need your cooperation."[1] A similar call was repeated in the next issue: "WE try to make the Aryan progressive[,] that is[,] a live member of the newspaper fraternity. SO please do kindly send us odds and ends from your locality. To have all news fresh and up-to-date we need the co-operation of our readers."[1] From "news" to "brief notes" to "odds and ends", Singh reassured his readers that any small item would be of interest. Lacking the resources to maintain a staff of reporters but still

[118] "To Our Readers," *AC*, 5 August 1911.

wanting to be considered "a true newspaper," editors transformed their dependence on their readers into something positive, making the newspaper a collaborative, communal project.

Editors also asked readers to weigh in with their opinions on political organizations or movements. *Indian Views* published an article suggesting that the political conference of Cape Indians be converted into Union-wide conference. They concluded the article with an invitation to write to or personally stop by the *Indian Views* office for those readers "interested in the holding of such a conference as is here outlined."[119] The *Indian Emigrant* offered a more limited call, "invit[ing] public opinion from all eminent men, the Hon'ble Members of the Imperial and Provincial Legislative Council, our numerous patrons and supporters and the public bodies in India on the important question of 'complete Reciprocity in Emigration'…All correspondence to be addressed to—The Editor, 'Indian Emigrant.'"[120] Editors believed that their papers were the most proper place for the airing of intra-Indian disputes. *Indian Opinion* noted with dismay that correspondence had appeared in a South African journal between Hindus and Muslims at a time when the South African Indian community should be (or at least appear) united. They reminded their readers that "Indian Opinion is a journal specially devoted to the discussion of all Indian affairs in South Africa; and that if unfortunately differences arise between Indians, our columns are the natural and most fitting medium for their ventilation."[121] The invitation to write in about political matters was not only a matter of producing political community, but also a technique for containing political divisions.

[119] "Cape Indians' Conference," *IV*, 23 March 1917.
[120] "Editor's Request," *Indian Emigrant*, September 1914.
[121] "Mohamedan versus Hindu," *IO*, 27 May 1905.

Even while inviting submissions, editors tried (often unsuccessfully) to control correspondence. Aiyar and Gandhi both refused to accept anonymous letters, insisting that although they would not publish an author's name without his or her consent, a name and address were required "as a guarantee of good faith."[122] *Indian Opinion*, for example, refused to publish a letter by an indentured Indian unless he wrote again with his name and address. [123] This required the "Indentured Samy [sic]" to find time, money, and paper (all of which were in scarce supply for indentured Indians) to send another missive in order to have his first published. Editors also required correspondents to pay postage. Aiyar noted irritatedly that "letters deficiently stamped are often dispatched to this office, and we have been mulcted in payment of surcharged fees. Henceforth no surcharged correspondence will be accepted."[124] Two years later, *African Chronicle* received a number of letters on the proposed Hindu conference but the office had to pay the cost of stamps. "This conduct leads us to infer that the writers are not serious in what they say."[125] Aiyar believed that investing stamp money indicated a intentionality and investment (literally) on the part of readers. It also required a level of class and education that created a threshold for who could participate in these debates. Other papers laid out even more guidelines. As the volume of correspondence increased during the passive resistance movement, *Indian Opinion* also felt it necessary stipulate that "Letters and other communications should be written on one side of the paper only…Space being a consideration, correspondents are requested to be brief and to the point."[126] While some

[122] "Publisher's Notice," *CIN*, 18 May 1901; "Correspondence," *IO*, 16 July 1904.
[123] "Facts and Comments," *IO*, 2 December 1905.
[124] "To Correspondents," *AC*, 11 December 1909.
[125] "Reply to Correspondents," *AC*, 27 April 1912.
[126] "Editorial Notices: Correspondence," *IO*, 19 September 1908.

of these items were practical requirements, others were about policing the tone and format of the paper by imposing conventions on correspondents.

Editors refused to publish letters that they felt were personal attacks[127] or which would not serve the public interest.[128] *Indian Opinion* rejected a letter from A. Royeppen on the grounds that "apart from its inordinate length…even at the time it was written, [it] dealt with a stale subject."[129] Other times, it was not the topic but the tone to which editors objected. Aiyar told "Anti-Congressman"

> "Although there may be a good deal of truth…yet we cannot publish that which has gone beyond the legitimate boundary of criticism. Moreover the policy of this Journal prevents us from giving publicity to such articles as yours, which in our opinion, instead of tending to cement the various classes together, will contribute to cause disruption and ill-feeling among them, and on the whole, will give a death-blow to that ghost of unity…However, we have no objection to publish reasonable criticisms on the subject. As we have no time to tone down and to correct at present, your contribution is rejected with thanks."[130]

Although Aiyar was happy to criticize the Natal Indian Congress, he insisted on maintaining an appropriately decorous or respectable tone for his paper, leading him to censor contributions. *Indian Opinion* insisted that correspondents would appreciate this censorship, telling Doorasamy S. Chetty, "Your letter did not appear last week for the reason then stated. You would be the first man to regret it had we printed it as received."[131]

Editors did not shy away from telling readers when their interpretation of political events was incorrect. *Indian Views* told one correspondent that they would not publish his

---

[127] "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 24 May 1901; *CIN*, 14 June 1901; *AC*, 2 September 1911; "Correspondence," *IO*, 16 July 1904.
[128] "Reply to Correspondents," *AC*, 27 April 1912; "General Notes and News," *AC*, 13 March 1909; "Correspondence," *IV*, 4 December 1914; "Facts and Comments," *IO*, 11 March 1905.
[129] "Correspondence," *IO*, 8 April 1911.
[130] "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 24 May 1901.
[131] *IO*, 23 December 1905.

letter because it would "provok[e] a useless controversy" and because most "of the points raised in your letter are entirely due to misapprehensions on your part and therefore we prefer not to take notice of them."[132] On another occasion, Aiyar published a letter from "Bonum Verum" urging the Indian Women Association to focus on education. Aiyar agreed with this advice, but suggested that

> "Our correspondent could do better service for the cause he has espoused by organising a series of lectures on the subject…than by addressing English Newspapers which are, as a rule, seldom perused, much less read by these maidens. tI [sic] should be distinctly understood that we are not disinclined to publish anything that might be of some use to our readers, but we made this suggestion with a view that our correspondent might direct his energies in a more practicable [sic] direction…--Editor, A. C."[133]

Presuming to know his readership, Aiyar assumed that young women did not read English-language newspapers. While encouraging Bonum Verum's interest in communal uplift, Aiyar remained convinced that his newspaper was not the best forum for this issue. This is curious given how much ink and paper Aiyar spent on advocating education. One wonders what (besides sexism) made Aiyar so much more certain than Bonum Verum that this advice published in the paper would not reach its intended audience.

Correspondence columns often became a site of contention, as readers disagreed with each other and with the editor. Editors tried different strategies to control these dissenting opinions, but readers' correspondence columns often ended up transforming the paper from the monovocal proscriptive literature that editors intended into a polyvocal site of vigorous debate. Readers regularly wrote in to criticize political organizations. Both *Colonial Indian News* and *African Chronicle*, for instance, often received criticisms of the Natal Indian Congress and the British Indian Association,

[132] "Correspondence," *IV*, 4 December 1914.
[133] Bonum Verum [pseud.], "Correspondence: Female Education," *AC*, 10 October 1908.

organizations that Aiyar himself was often at odds with.[134] Other correspondents criticized the politics of the editor of the paper to which they were writing. One correspondent to *Indian Opinion* argued that the NIC, with which Gandhi was involved, was neither democratic nor representative and urged the organization to decrease their annual membership fee from £3.3.0 to £1.1.0 at most.[135] In response to Gandhi's attempt to compromise with Smuts during the passive resistance movement, one correspondent wrote to the BIA wanting to know what the difference between voluntary and compulsory registration was.[136] While these Indian authors objected to Gandhi's politics as too conciliatory, white readers sometimes attacked *Indian Opinion* for being too incendiary. Herbert Kitchin objected to an article from *IO*'s "London Correspondent" that was seditious and far from *Indian Opinion'*s "usual moderate tone." *Indian Opinion* replied that the London Correspondent was merely voicing Indian patriotic sentiment.[137]

These disputes often involved not only criticism of political organizations, but of the papers themselves. During a heated dispute between *African Chronicle* and *Indian Opinion* on the truthfulness of the testimony of an indentured Indian women named Jumanee, a correspondent wrote in to *African Chronicle*, "I am surprised to see the Indian Opinion publishing in its columns a contradiction. I am prepared to declare on oath that Jumnia [sic] asked me to interpret what appeared in your journal and she unhesitatingly affirmed that what she said was solemn truth."[138] The same person reiterated this claim in

[134] Indian Perambulator [pseud.], "Original Correspondent," *CIN*, 31 May 1901; "Correspondence: How Long Shall Our Brothers in South Africa be Misguided," *AC*, 6 November 1909; Aryamitran [pseud.] "Correspondence," *AC*, 31 May 1913; Aryamitran [pseud.], "Correspondence," *AC*, 19 July 1913.
[135] "Correspondence," *IO*, 17 March 1906.
[136] Mr. Neser to Transvaal British Indian Association, quoted in "Mr. Neser Answered: Interesting Correspondence," *IO*, 5 October 1907.
[137] H. Kitchin, "Correspondence: A Charge of Sedition," *IO*, 14 July 1906.
[138] D. K. Guptay, "Correspondence," *AC*, 7 October 1911. Jumanee's name appeared many different ways in *AC*, including Jumanee, Jammuni, Jannumia, and Jannumiah.

Indian Opinion, adding that he was surprised that *Indian Opinion* believed the Protector of Immigrants rather than *African Chronicle*'s report.[139] In clearing his own name, this reader was also defending *African Chronicle*, who backed Jumanee's story, against *Indian Opinion*.

These debates rarely stopped with one correspondent, however. Frequently they sparked a back-and-forth between multiple readers over several issues. A letter from "Aryamitran" saying that local Indians were "disgusted" with the BIA and calling for a replacement of "our defeated leaders Messrs Gandhi and Pollack [sic]" in May 1913 initiated a volley of letters that continued for the next two months. A correspondent using the pseudonym "Captain" objected to Aryamitran's letter, following which a letter writer from the Stanger Indian Game Cock called for Gandhi's resignation and Aryamitran repeated that Indians should not wait for Gandhi to take the lead again, since he is defeated. A "Man from Stanger" than replied to "Stanger Indian Game Cock," saying that Gandhi was not resigning as leader because "he has never styled himself one. He is the servant of the community, and will serve the community in the best possible way as his conscience dictates."[140] This exchange transformed a single critique of Gandhi into an temporally and geographically extended debate that emphasized the simultaneous, polyvocal political community.

In some papers, most notably Aiyar's, readers challenged not only his political views but also his handling of correspondence itself. On several occasions, Aiyar would publish one or two articles between disagreeing correspondents and then insist that

[139] "Correspondence: The Case of Jannumia," *IO*, 7 October 1911.
[140] Aryamitran [pseud.], "Correspondence," *AC*, 31 May 1913; Captain [pseud.], "Gandhi-Gokhale Programme: Interesting Correspondence," *AC*, 5 July 1913; Stanger Indian Game Cock [pseud.], "Correspondence: Gandhi-Gokhale Programme," *AC*, 12 July 1913; Aryamitran [pseud.], "Correspondence," *AC*, 19 July 1913; A Man from Stanger [pseud.], "Correspondence," *AC*, 19 July 1913.

correspondence on the subject must cease.[141] However, he almost always went on to publish more correspondence on the topic, as readers implicitly and explicitly disputed his right to close the debate.[142] Intent upon the political space Aiyar promised them, readers challenged Aiyar's authority in managing the paper's political tone, adding even more voices to the conversation as debates moved from a discussion of the political issue at stake to a dispute over how such disagreements ought to be handled.[143] These contestations were as much about how to manifest citizenship through print culture as they were about the political content of the original message.

Sometimes editors refused to publish these criticisms, even as they acknowledged their existence. For instance, when Aiyar opposed the 1913 strike of indentured Indians, he received many "telegrams and letters…having reference to the policy of this journal." Without publishing these protests, Aiyar insisted that "while we are keenly sensible of our responsibility to the Indian community to ventilate their grievances through these columns in all legitimate manner, we, at the same time have to emphatically state that we cannot…countenance subversion of law and order."[144] The importance of maintaining decorum and respectability in Indian politics outweighed, for Aiyar, both the importance of democratic debate and the negative effect on his subscription rates.[145]

Ironically, these attempts to silence readers ultimately left their own record of dissent. In one case, *Indian Opinion* told readers exactly what the subject matter they refused to print was. In November 1907, the paper advertised a competition to see who

[141] A Subscriber [pseud.], "Original Correspondence," *CIN*, 7 March 1902; "Correspondence: Indian Perambulator," *CIN*, 14 June 1901; "Correspondence: The Indian Deputation," *AC*, 23 July 1910; A. Royeppen, "Correspondence: Magna Charta and King John," *AC*, 13 February 1909.
[142] John Stapley, "Coloured Question: Criticism on Mr. Baynes' Open Letter," *CIN*, 21 March 1902.
[143] Spector-Marks, "Magna Carta," 14-16.
[144] "From the Editor's Chair ," *AC*, 29 November 1913.
[145] Aiyar explicitly addressed the impact of his opposition to the strike on support for *AC* in an earlier article "From the Editor's Chair: The True Position of £3 Tax Payers," *AC*, 8 November 1913.

could write the best paper on the efficacy and morality of passive resistance. The paper would be translated and edited for publication in *Indian Opinion*. The guidelines for the competition were as strict as any school assignment: submissions must be written clearly on one side of the paper only, preferably typed; it could be divided into four chapters but should not be longer than ten columns of *Indian Opinion*. The author must analyze Thoreau's *On the duty of Civil Disobedience*, Tolstoy's *The kingdom of Heaven is Within You*, and refer to the *Apology of Socrates*, biblical and other religious authorities, and examples from modern history.[146] Reverend J. Landau of Cape Colony originally agreed to judge the competition, but resigned when he decided the topic was too political. Reverend Joseph Doke, a passive resistance supporter, stepped in instead.[147] Given the intertwined stakes of race, literacy, and citizenship, it is striking that both judges were of European descent. Gandhi clearly wanted the stamp of British approval, on the quality of the papers as well as on their arguments in favor passive resistance. In spite of a substantial award of ten guineas for the winning entry and the fact that the deadline was extended from November 30th to December 31st, only four correspondents bothered to reply.[148] One gets the impression that the winner, a colonial-born named M. S. Maurice, only won by default. The article announcing the prize-winning publication noted that of the four essays submitted, "one failed completely," the second-place author confused passive and active resistance and did not use either Thoreau or Tolstoy effectively, and the third place author, while expressing good ideas, wrote English so poorly that his points were unclear and also did not deal with Tolstoy. One of the submissions "has

[146] "A Prize of Ten Guineas: For an Essay on 'The Ethics of Passive resistance,'" *IO*, 9 November 1907. The winning essay was eventually published as "The Ethics of Passive Resistance: Prize Essay (Winner of the Prize—Mr. M. S. Maurice)," *IO*, 18 April 1908.
[147] "Prize Essay Competition: Judge's Award," *IO*, 25 January 1908.
[148] "A Prize of Ten Guineas: For an Essay on 'The Ethics of Passive resistance,'" *IO*, 9 November 1907.

missed the subject altogether. His whole argument appears to be in favor of Force, as opposed to Passive Resistance."[149] Although this statement tried to spin the essay as a careless or ill-educated reader "missing the mark," the choice of "Nacte Virtute," or "Finding Strength," as the title for the essay indicates that this author disagreed with Gandhi over the efficaciousness of passive resistance and used this opportunity to voice his or her objections. Although the prize competition hearkened back to grammar school assignments of required reading and Latin mottos, Gandhi's attempt to render his readers as compliant, acquiescent schoolchildren failed, as at least two of his readers fundamentally challenged Gandhi's championing of passive resistance. Unlike the docile and easily-swayed Reader of *Hind Swaraj*'s Socratic method, *Indian Opinion*'s actual readers were a vocal and opinionated citizenry. Despite Gandhi's attempts to retain editorial control, readers' dissenting voices emerged clearly, if only in the traces left behind by Gandhi's refusal to print them.

Sometimes, it was the production of the paper itself that betrayed internal disputes and revealed the editor's inability to maintain a single authorial voice. Aiyar did most of the creative and editorial labor for *African Chronicle*, as is evidenced by the weeks when his illness prevented publication.[150] However, Aiyar was not the only producer of his newspaper. This fact became clear to readers on 22 November 1913, when Aiyar apologized for the condensed form of the paper—only two pages of English as opposed to the usual five to eight pages. As discussed in chapter four, Aiyar objected strenuously to Gandhi's extension of the passive resistance movement to include a strike by indentured Indians. Despite his opposition to the strike of indentured Indians, "[t]he

[149] "Prize Essay Competition: Judge's Award," *IO*, 25 January 1908. See also *IO*'s statement that they were disappointed with the results of the competition ("The Ethics of Passive Resistance," *IO*, 18 April 1908).
[150] "City Schools," *CIN*, 14 February 1902; "Notice to our Subscribers," *CIN*, 23 April 1902.

Compositors, employed in our office, having joined the ranks of the strikers, we regret, we are unable to publish our paper in its usual form."[151] I have found no record of Aiyar's compositors being indentured, yet they clearly saw themselves in solidarity with indentured Indians. The compositors challenged Aiyar's politics, first by marching in the streets with other lower-class Indians and then in *African Chronicle*'s implicit recognition of their disagreement with Aiyar. Non-elite voices recurrently emerged in many forms, making diasporic print citizenship a messy and contested concept and rupturing the attempts of political elites to discipline and contain it.

Conclusion

Newspapers were the primary means by which diasporic Indians espoused their rights to imperial citizenship, not just by the discourse, but in the very material production and circulation of this print culture. Activists understood literacy to be a crucial shibboleth of citizenship. In producing newspapers, books, and pamphlets, as well as petitions, addresses, and other political documents, they were asserting and evidencing their right to citizenship. Disenfranchised from traditional forms of political expression, editors and readers alike used the newspaper as a site in which to practice their own version of imperial citizenship. Yet even amongst themselves, editors and readers could not always agree on what the proper forms of print citizenship were. Production of newspapers was a process of both proscription and cacophony as editors and readers debated the political meaning of citizenship and the proper manifestation of that citizenship, not just in but through print culture. At once diasporic, nationalist, and imperial, participants crafted for themselves new forms of print citizenship.

[151] "From the Editor's Chair: Ourselves," *AC*, 22 November 1913.

Conclusion

Imperial Citizenship and the Limits of Transnationalism

In 1922, moderate Indian nationalist V. S. Srinivasa *Sastri* went on a tour of the Dominions, advocating better treatment for Indians overseas as per the Imperial Conferences of 1919 and 1921. Yet the Union Government refused to allow Sastri to come to South Africa.[1] And when Sastri reached Canada, Indians in British Columbia were adamant that "anything he could do or say would merely have the effect of further humilitating [sic] them without any good results." Indeed, Sastri said that "they were so emphatic in this that they treated him roughly."[2] Sastri's tour, ostensibly taken as an Indian nationalist's defense of imperial citizenship, in fact revealed how ineffectual and unpopular imperial citizenship had become in the aftermath of 1914.[3]

The unsatisfactory Gandhi-Smuts agreement of 1914 undermined the idea that British subjects could travel freely anywhere in the empire and established domiciled Indians as second-class citizens within the South African nation. Colonial-born Indians in particular turned in the 1910s and 1920s to advocating their rights as South Africans rather than appealing to Indian or British authorities.[4] In Canada, the deportation of the Komagata Maru passengers marked the end of Indian immigration for the next fifty years. The mass exodus of several thousand Indians from North America to join Ghadr's

---

[1] Pachai*, International Aspects*, 97.
[2] Joseph Pope to Mackenzie King, 19 August 1922, LAC RG25 G-1, Volume 1300, File 1011, R219-100-6-E.
[3] Sastri, like Gandhi, was a mentee of Gopal Gokhale's and served as president of the Servants of India Society, focused on problems of Indians overseas. But by 1920, Sastri had split from the INC, creating the moderate National Liberal Foundation with official encouragement in order to counter Gandhian radicalism (Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 43). Sastri's 1921 tour was criticized by many Indian nationalists as empire apologism (Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 62).
[4] Swan, *Gandhi*, 17, 197, 205; "The Union bill," *AC*, 21 August 1909; J. W. Godfrey, quoted in "Indian Deputation [to D. F. Malan, Minster of the Interior] 16th November 1925," GLDC HIST/O/SAIC 1920s; "South African Indian Congress Emergency Conference Sixth Session, Durban 6th and 7th December, 1926," GLDC, HIST/O/SAIC 1920s; "South African Indian Congress Annual Conference (7th Session) held on the 12th, 13th and 14th March, 1927 at Johannesburg, Transvaal," GLDC HIST/O/SAIC 1920s.

rebellion and the internecine violence that followed in the aftermath of these events left Canadian Indians without political leadership.[5] The remaining population focused on assimilation and survival, hoping to avoid attention by the virulently anti-Asiatic Tory Member of Parliament H. H. Stevens and other racist politicians. At the imperial level, the passage of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act of 1914 ensured that those naturalized in the Dominions would be recognized as British subjects by Britain but did not require the Dominions to recognize subjects naturalized in Britain.[6] Indian activists were quick to point out that the law did away with any conception of common imperial citizenship by enshrining the Dominions' right to develop their own naturalization laws independent of Britain.[7] Although the outbreak of World War I provided a temporary fillip to rhetoric of imperial citizenship, the power and appeal of that discourse was largely exhausted by events in 1914 prior to the war itself. Even before the disappointment of the post-war Wilsonian moment, then, imperial citizenship had become a largely discredited political discourse.[8] The experiences of overseas Indians in South Africa and Canada in 1914 played a crucial role in development and the devolution of imperial citizenship.

Despite the eventual triumph of the nation-state and its imposition of exclusive citizenship, however, this dissertation urges scholars to attend to the ways in which

[5] Ramnath, *Haj to Utopia*, 51, 93, 148; Johnston, *Voyage,* chapters ten through thirteen.
[6] Karatani, *Defining*, 29-30, 80; Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 37. This 1914 Act was reinforced by subsequent declarations of the Dominions' control over immigration policy in Imperial Conferences in 1918, 1921, and 1923 (Tinker, *Separate and Unequal*, 28, 31, 47-74.).
[7] *African Times and Orient Review* (24 March 1914), quoted in "Imperial Citizenship," *Indian Emigrant,* September 1914; "The Naturalisation Bill," *IO*, 24 June 1914; Allahabad *Leader*, quoted in "Imperial Naturalisation Bill," *IO*, 15 April 1914; "Imperial Parliament: "Special Report for 'India' of All Parliamentary Proceedings Relating to India": Wednesday, May 13: House of Commons: The Naturalisation Bill," *India*, 22 May 1914.
[8] Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Michael Adas, "Contested Hegemony: World War I and the Afro-Asian Assault on the Civilizing Mission Ideology," *Journal of World History*, 15, no. 1 (March 2004): 31-63; Sinha, "Strange Death."

diasporic Indians imagined alternative forms of belonging enabled by imperial citizenship. Indian activists were successful, not in gaining concrete rights with imperial citizenship, but in making imperial citizenship the ubiquitous and undisputed terms of debate. During a period of crucial global transformation and throughout the era of determined nation-building by white settlers, Indian activists succeeded in insisting that all, regardless of race or political party, address their conceptions of imperial citizenship. That is an exceptional feat. Rather than accepting the nation-state as the inevitable outcome, it is important to look at historical alternatives. At the turn of the twentieth century, diasporic subjects struggled to articulate political belonging based on multiple, pluralistic identities (Indian, imperial South African, colonial-born, Tamil, Muslim, etc.) that were nonetheless undergirded by restrictions based on class, gender, and race. We are living at a time when everyone from schools to corporations tout the age of global citizenship but when Syrian refugees are being killed by Turkish border guards, right- and left-wing nationalists alike are calling for the devolution of the EU, and black citizens in the US are being murdered with impunity. Surely in this moment, it is salient to reflect on the possibilities and pitfalls of previous transnational movements.

Transnationalism from the Peripheries of Empire

In this dissertation, I argue that print culture played a fundamental role in shaping political discourse in a diasporic and imperial context. The material constraints of editors—paper, type, ink, compositors, authors, translators, telegraphs, and mail ships—affected the ways in which activist discourse circulated. As chapter four demonstrates, the transnational distribution of these texts created a shared language of imperial citizenship and connected activists in Rangoon with those in Durban or Vancouver with

those in Kobe. At the same time, these texts constrained as much as they enabled connection. As shown in chapter five, debates over literacy, from the address of a petition to the proper citation of a history textbook, were fundamental to claims to citizenship. Literacy and its use in defending rights of citizenship were implicitly premised on excluding those who did not write or read "correctly." I argue that there was a fundamental imbrication between the discourse of imperial citizenship and the material culture in which it circulated. I use this connection to examine the enormous success of Indians in asserting imperial citizenship at a discursive level over a period of twenty-five years. Tracking Indian political print culture in South Africa and Canada demonstrates the ubiquity of imperial citizenship *and* the nuances that accrued to that discourse in these two very different locations.

My research connects two relatively peripheral places in the British empire, Durban and Vancouver, revealing how widespread the discourse of imperial citizenship really was and the multifarious purposes it served. For diasporic Indians maneuvering between multiple governments, imperial citizenship offered a flexible and powerful discourse with which to assert belonging and challenge racial exclusion. Imperial citizenship could exist in tandem with assertions of Indian national identity and in defense of greater rights of self-government for India itself. Moreover, it could also work in concert with diasporic subjects' claims for greater rights in their country of domicile. The two opposing versions of nationalism espoused by Gandhi and the Ghadr Party, both nurtured in diaspora and in encounter with white settler racism, happened with a connected simultaneity. For both, although for very different reasons, assertions of

nationalism and opposition to racial exclusion were entangled with the discourse of imperial citizenship.

Imperial citizenship was capable of drawing together widely disparate groups of people, using a broad and inchoate discourse that provided an umbrella under which individuals with quite different political goals formed transient but useful alliances. Gandhi, for instance, worked not only with both Naoroji and Bhownaggree, but also with Ampthill and Curzon, bringing together in the British Parliament voices from Indian and British MPs in the Liberal and Conservative parties, from presidents of the INC, and from staunch opponents of Indian nationalism. In North America, meanwhile, Ghadr Party activists who planned to overthrow the British Raj, although critical of Gandhi, nonetheless supported the passive resistance movement and wrote English-language defenses of Indians' immigration rights in terms of imperial citizenship.

When one looks at Natal and British Columbia through a transnational and comparative lens, what emerges is the extent to which Indian imperial citizenship posed a real threat to the empire. The circulation and re-circulation of the discourse of imperial citizenship discussed in chapter one created an echo chamber in which Indian activists' use of imperial citizenship generated a sense of urgent crisis throughout the empire. This increased the pressure on the imperial government, as disparate local movements gained volume and urgency from circulation through transnational and imperial print culture. The simultaneity of this discourse across these far-flung, peripheral places shook British confidence in the metropole itself. Many agreed with the *Manchester Guardian*'s assessment that "If a historian in the future came to write the decline and fall of the British Empire, we can imagine a chapter in which he saw the beginning of the end in the

neglect by the Dominions of their responsibilities to the [other] races of the Empire."[9] Observers worried that the conflict between white settlers and Indian immigrants would prove the undoing of the British empire. This fear compelled governments in South Africa, Canada, Britain, and India to respond to local activists. So, at one level, the invocation of imperial citizenship through these alliances *worked*; it evoked a response from imperial and colonial governments, although that response was never as swift or strong as activists would have preferred.

At the same time, however, my research shows the fragility and superficiality of the connections generated by the shared language of imperial citizenship. Chapters two and three emphasize the particularity of racial meaning that accrued to imperial citizenship as activists in different places and with different political objectives shaped the discourse to serve their own ends. The specific racial and political fields within which Indian activists operated greatly shaped their use of imperial citizenship. Colonial-born Indians in South Africa, for instance, used imperial citizenship to differentiate themselves from both Afrikaners and black Africans while sustaining an alliance with Chinese passive resisters. In contrast, Punjabi Sikh immigrants in Canada used imperial citizenship to exclude the Chinese and Japanese. Labor as well as race played a role, with Sikhs emphasizing their military service as evidence of their imperial citizenship, whereas South African Indians highlighted their role as agricultural laborers and settlers (downplaying the trade that financed the activism of most of the elite political leadership). Add to this the Ghadr party's dominance of the Canadian Indian political

[9] Manchester Guardian, quoted in "Truth Will Out," *India*, 28 November 1913. See also: *Winnipeg Free Press*, quoted in "The Indians in Canada," *IO*, 9 May 1908; London correspondent for *The Times of India*, quoted in "General News," *AC,* 22 October 1910; Crewe, quoted in "The Imperial Conference," *AC,* 29 July 1911.

scene, juxtaposed with South African Indians' emphasis on constitutional methods of agitation augmented with passive resistance. Given these radically different political and racial contexts, it becomes apparent why activists in the two places never developed more substantial forms of political cooperation. Periodicals, speeches, and petitions clearly show that each group was aware of each other and referenced the other as a way of enhancing their own political agenda. However, these strategic references did not translate into the kinds of concrete activism marked by fundraising, direct correspondence between leaders, or shared political protests. Putting Natal and British Columbia in the same field of vision reveals the surprising simultaneity of Indian protests against white settler racism; at the same time, it also demonstrates the distinct limits of those alliances.

Conclusion

This dissertation provides a cautionary reading of the difficulty of building a transnational political movement. It does so by examining a specific historical moment when Indian activists across the British empire articulated a global problem with an imperial solution and yet failed to establish lasting transnational political connections. The specific racial and political contexts in which South African and Indian Canadians located themselves made deep and material political alliances difficult or even undesirable. Moreover, activists in both places chose not to ally themselves with other disenfranchised groups in the area, opting instead for the precarious possibility of upward racial and class mobility. The activists I study were extremely successful at mobilizing support and generating a shared discourse across the empire. They did so in large part through the circulation and citation of a shared body of print culture. It was within and

through this diasporic print culture that the discourse of imperial citizenship emerged. Yet the language that they produced itself imposed restrictions on their activism. The focus on respectability and masculinity, expressed through European dress, "proper" language usage, and the patriarchal protection of family immigration and Mother India alike, allowed Indian activists to aspire to political belonging on British terms. Yet this also transformed the ostensibly inclusive imperial citizenship they advocated into one which was mediated through the exclusion of others, those whom activists deemed unable to access respectability based on class, language, race, gender, or a myriad of other factors. The divisions caused by this approach fostered friction and indifference between activists locally and globally. The discourse they ostensibly shared was in fact riven by contradiction and competition in a way that crucially shaped the development of the British empire and Indian nationalism alike.

Archival Collections

British Library, India Office Records and Private Papers,
Library and Archives of Canada, Immigration Branch
Library and Archives of Canada, Department of the Secretary of State
Library and Archives of Canada, Sir Robert Borden Papers
Library and Archives of Canada, Sir Wilfred Laurier Papers
Library and Archives of Canada, William Lyon Mackenzie King Papers
Library and Archives of Canada, H. H. Stevens Papers
Library and Archives of Canada, Kartar Singh Fonds
National Archives Repository (Pretoria) (Public Records of the former Transvaal Province), Governor of the Transvaal Colony
National Archives Repository (Pretoria) (Public Records of the Central Government since 1910), Governor-General
National Archives Repository (Pretoria) (Public Records of the Central Government since 1910), Secretary of Home Affairs
Pietermaritzburg Archives Repository, Colonial Secretary Office
Pietermaritzburg Archives Repository, Indian Immigration Department
Simon Fraser University, Indo-Canadian Collection
The National Archives (Kew), Colonial Office Records
University of British Columbia Archives
University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Gandhi Luthuli Documentation Center
University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Killie Campbell Africana Library
Vancouver City Archives, H. H. Stevens Papers

Newspapers

African Chronicle (Durban) 1908-1921
The Bengalee (Calcutta) May-June 1914
Canada and India July and October 1915
Colonial Indian News (Pietermaritzburg) 1901-1902
India (London) 1913-1914
Indian Opinion (Phoenix) 1903-1914
Ghadr (translation) (San Francisco) 1913-1920
The Aryan (Victoria) 1911-1912
The Hindustanee (Vancouver) January-June 1914
The Indian Emigrant (Madras) 1914-1918
The Indian Views (Natal) 1914-1915
The Modern Review (Calcutta) 1914
The Sansar (Victoria) January-June 1914

Published and Other Primary Sources

A Hindu-Canadian. *India's Appeal to Canada or An Account of Hindu Immigration to the Dominion*. 1915
Aiyar, P. Subramania. *The Indian Problem in South Africa*. Durban: African Chronicle Printing Works, 1925.

Andrews, C. F., ed. *Documents Relating to the Indian Question*. Cape Town: Cape Times Limited, n.d.
---. *Documents Relating to the New Asiatic bill and the Alleged Breach of Faith*. [Cape Town: Cape Times Ltd., 1926].
Bannerji, Indu Prakas. "Hindu Immigration." Master's Thesis, University of Nebraska, Department of Economics and Commerce, May 1915.
Broad, Isabella Ross. *An Appeal for Fair Play for the Sikhs in Canada*. 1913.
Canada India Committee. *The Hindu Case*. Toronto, 1915.
Canada India Committee. *A Call for Canadian Justice.* Toronto, 1915.
Chandra, Ram. *India Against Britain: A Reply to Austin Chamberlain Secretary of State for India, Lord Hardinge Former Viceroy of India, Lord Islington Under Secretary of State and Others*. San Francisco: [Hindustan Gadar, 1916?]. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015065567334;view=1up;seq=3.
Das, Taraknath. *India in World Politics*. New York: B. W. Huebsch, Inc., 1923.
Gandhi, M. K. *The Indian Franchise: An Appeal To every Briton in South Africa.* Durban T. L. Cullingworth, December 1895.
---. *Notes on the Grievances of the British Indians in South Africa*. Rajkot: 22 September 1896.
---. *Autobiography: The Story of my Experiments with Truth*. First published 1924-1928. New York: Dover, 1983.
M. K. Gandhi, *Satygraha in South Africa* (Ahmedabad: Navajivan Trust, 1928, 1968) http://www.mkgandhi.org/ebks/satyagraha_in_south_africa.pdf.
Indian National Congress. *Report of the Thirtieth Indian National Congress, Held at Bombay on the 27th, 28th, and 29th December, 1915*. Indian National Congress: Bombay 1916.
Indicus. *Labour and Other Questions in South Africa: Being Mainly Considerations on the Rational and Profitable Treatment of the Coloured Races living There*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903.
Isemonger, F. C. and J. Slattery. *An Account of the Ghadr Conspiracy* (1913-1915). Foreword by Ved Prakash Vatuk. 1st Printing Lahore: Government Printing, 1919. Sadar, Meerut: Archana Publications, 1998.
Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Minute on Indian Education." 1835. http://www.mssu.edu/projectsouthasia/history/primarydocs/education/Macaulay001.htm.
Misrow, Jogesh. "East Indian Immigration on the Pacific Coast." Stanford, CA: May 1915. https://www.saada.org/item/20120123-599.
Nundy, Edward. *The Transvaal Asiatic Ordinance, 1907: An Exposure*. Johannesburg: The Transvaal Leader, 1907.
[Polak, Henry S. L.] *The South African Indian. Helot or Citizen?* Indians Overseas Association, [January 1926]. https://v1.sahistory.org.za/pages/pdf/The%20south%20african%20indian%20Helot%20or%20Citizen.pdf
Rajani, Kanta Das. *Hindustani Workers on the Pacific Coast*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter De Gruyter & Co, 1922.
Report of the Komagata Maru Committee of Inquiry and Some Further Documents. Introduction by Darshan S. Tatla. First published Calcutta: Government of India, 1915. Chandigarh: Unistar Books Pvt. Ltd, 2007.
Singh, Saint Nihal. "The Indian Immigration Crisis in South Africa." *Fortnightly Review* 95 (1914).

S[ingh], S[under] and L. W. H[all]. *Summary of the Hindu Question and its results in British Columbia presented by the Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu to the Empire as a Whole*. Victoria, Victoria Society of Friends of the Hindu: May 1911.
Singh, Sunder. "The Hindu in Canada." *The Journal of Race Development* 7, no. 3 (January 1917): 361-382.
Stevens, H. H. *The Oriental Problem: Dealing With Canada as Affected by the Immigration of Japanese, Hindu and Chinese*. [Vancouver, 1912].
Waiz, S. A. *Indians Abroad*, 2nd ed. Bombay: Indian Daily Mail Press, 1927.
Waraich, Malwinderjit Singh and Gurdev Singh Sidhu, eds. *Komagata Maru: A Challenge to Colonialism: Key Documents*. Chandigarh: Unistar Books Pvt. Ltd., 2007.

Secondary Sources

Adas, Michael. "Contested Hegemony: World War I and the Afro-Asian Assault on the Civilizing Mission Ideology." *Journal of World His tory*, 15, no. 1 (March 2004): 31-63.
Aiyar, Sana. "Anticolonial Homelands Across the Indian Ocean: Politics of the Indian Diaspora in Kenya, ca. 1930-1950." *American Historical Review* 116, no. 4 (2011): 987-1013.
---. "Empire, Race and the Indians in Colonial Kenya's Contested Public Political Sphere, 1919-1923." *Africa: Special Issue on Print Cultures, Nationalisms, and Publics of the Indian Ocean*, edited by Isabel Hofmeyr, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 132-154.
---. *Indians in Kenya: The Politics of Diaspora*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.
Allen, Margaret. "'Innocents abroad' and 'prohibited immigrants': Australians in India and Indians in Australia 1890-1910." In *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, edited by Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2005.
Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition. London: Verso, 1983, 1991.
Anderson, Clare. *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Anderson, Warwick. *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.
Aydin, Cemil. "A Global Anti-Western Moment? The Russo-Japanese War, Decolonization, and Asian Modernity." In *Competing Visions of World Order: Global Moments and Movements, 1880s-1930s*, edited by Sebastian Conrad and Dominic Sachsenmaier. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
Bald, Vivek. "Desertion and Sedition: Indian Seamen, Onshore Labor, and Expatriate Radicalism in New York and Detroit, 1914-1930." In *The Sun Never Sets: South Asian Migrants in an Age of U. S. Power*, edited by Vivek Bald, Miabi Chatterjee, Sujani Reddy, and Manu Vimalassery. New York: New York University, 2013.
Baldwin, James. *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Nonfiction 1948-1985.* New York: St. Martin's/Marek, 1985.
Ballantyne, Tony. *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire.* Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
---. *Between Colonialism and Diaspora: Sikh Cultural Formations in an Imperial World*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.

---. "Reading the newspaper in Colonial Otago." *Journal of New Zealand Studies: Special Issue: Communicating Culture in Colonial New Zealand*, edited by Tony Ballantyne, Lachy Paterson, and Angela Wanhalla, No. 12 (2011): 47-64.
---. "Remaking the World: Communication, Colonialism and Global Connections." In *Empires and the Reach of the Global, 1870-1945*, edited by Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
Banerjee, Sikata. *Make me a Man! Masculinity, Hinduism, and Nationalism in India*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.
Banerjee, Sukanya. "Empire, the Indian Diaspora and the Place of the Universal." *Diaspora* 15, no. 1 (Spring 2006): 147-166.
---. *Becoming Imperial Citizens: Indians in the Late-Victorian Empire*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.
Barrett, James R. and David R. Roediger. "Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and the 'New Immigrant' Working Class. *Journal of American Ethnic History* 16, no. 3 (Spring, 1997): 3-44.
Barrier, Norman Gerald. "The Literature of Confrontation: An Introduction to Banned Publications in British Punjab." *Indian Archives* 21, no. 1 (1972): 9-32.
---. *Banned: Controversial Literature and Political Control in British India, 1907-1947*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1974.
Bashford, Alison. "At the Border: Contagion, Immigration, Nation." *Australian Historical Studies* 33, no. 120 (October 2002): 344-358.
Bashi, Vilna. "Globalized anti-blackness: Trasnationalizing Western immigration law, policy, and practice." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27, no. 4 (July 2004): 584-606.
Basran, Gurcharn S. and B. Singh Bolaria. *The Sikhs in Canada: Migration, Race, Class, and Gender*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003.
Bayly, Susan. "Caste and 'Race' in the Colonial Ethnography of India." In *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, edited by Peter Robb. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Bell, Duncan. *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of the World, 1860-1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
Bhana, Surendra. *Gandhi's Legacy: The Natal Indian Congress 1894-1994*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1997.
Bhana, Surendra and Joy B. Brain. *Setting Down Roots: Indian Migrants in South Africa, 1860-1911*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1990.
Bhana, Surendra and Goolam Vahed. *The Making of a Political Reformer: Gandhi in South Africa, 1893-1914*. New Delhi: Manohar Press, 2005.
Boehmer, Elleke. "Failure to connect: resistant modernities at national crossroads: Solomon Plaatje and Mohandas Gandhi." In *Beyond the Black Atlantic: Relocating Modernization and Technology* edited by W. Goebel and Saskia Schabo. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.
Bosco, Andrea and Alex May, eds. *The Round Table: The Empire-Commonwealth and British Foreign Policy*. London: Lothian Foundation Press, 1997.
Bose, Neilesh. "New Settler Colonial Histories at the Edges of Empire: 'Asiatics,' settlers, and law in colonial South Africa." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 15, no. 1 (2014).
Bose, Sugata. *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Boucher, Leigh. "'Whiteness,' Geopolitical Reconfiguration, and the Settler Empire in Nineteenth-Century Victorian Politics." In *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, eds. Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
Boucher, Leigh, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus, eds. "Re-Orienting Whiteness: A New Agenda for the Field." In *Re-Orienting Whiteness*, edited by Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
Bradshaw, Richard and James Ransdell. "Anti-Asian Agitation in South Africa in the 1930s: Reaction to the 'Japanese Treaty' and 'Honorary White' Status." *Southeast Review of Asian Studies* 32 (2010): 3-21.
Brennan, James R. "Politics and Business in the Indian newspapers of Colonial Tanganyika." *Africa: Special Issue on Print Cultures, Nationalisms, and Publics of the Indian Ocean*, edited by Isabel Hofmeyr, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 42-67.
---. TAIFA: *Making Nation and Race in Urban Tanzania*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012.
Brown, Judith M. "Gandhi—a Victorian gentleman: An essay in imperial encounter." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 27, no. 2 (1999): 68-85.
Burton, Antoinette. *At the Heart of the empire: Indians and the Colonial Encounter in Late-Victorian Britain*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
---. "Tongues Untied: Lord Salisbury's 'Black Man' and the Boundaries of Imperial Democracy." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43, no. 2 (2000): 632-661.
---. "Imperial Optics: Empire Histories, Interpretive Methods." In *Empire in Question: Reading, Writing, and Teaching British Imperialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011.
Caplan, Lionel. "Martial Gurkhas: The Persistence of a British military Discourse on 'Race.'" In *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, edited by Peter Robb. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Chandra, Shefali. "Whiteness on the Margins of Native Patriarchy: Race, Caste, Sexuality, and the Agenda of Transnational Studies." *Feminist Studies* 37, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 127-153.
Chang, Kornel. "Enforcing Transnational White Solidarity: Asian Migration and the Formation of the U.S. – Canadian Boundary." *American Quarterly* 60, no. 3 (September 2008): 671-696.
---. *Pacific Connections: The Making of the US-Canadian Borderlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
Chatterjee, Margaret. *Gandhi and his Jewish friends*. Houndmills: Macmillan Academic and Professional, Ltd., 1992.
Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*, 2nd edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986, 1993.
---. *The Nation and its Fragments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
Chiles, Katy L. *Transformable Race: Surprising Metamorphoses in the Literature of Early America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Choudhury, Deep Kanta Lahiri. *Telegraphic Imperialism: Crisis and Panic in the Indian Empire, c. 1830*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Codell, Julie. "Introduction: Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press." In *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press*, edited by Julie Codell. New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 2003.
---. "Decentring and Doubling Imperial Cosmpolitan Discourse in the British Press: Dadabhai Naoroji and M. M. Bhownaggree." *Media History* 15, no. 4 (2009): 371-384.

Cooper, Frederick and Ann Laura Stoler. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California, 1997.
Darnton, Robert. "Literary Surveillance in the British Raj: The Contradictions of Liberal Imperialism." *Book History* 4 (2001): 133-176.
Darwin, John. "A Third Empire: The Dominion Idea in Imperial Politics." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire: the Twentieth Century*, edited by Judith M. Brown and William Roger Louis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
Desai, Ashwin and Goolam Vahed. *The South African Gandhi: Stretcher-Bearer of Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016.
Detre, Laura. "Canada's Campaign for Immigrants and the Images in *Canada West* Magazine." *Great Plains Quarterly* 24 (Spring 2004): 113-29.
Dhupelia-Mesthrie, Uma. "The Form, the Permit and the Photograph: An Archive of Mobility between South African and India." *Journal of Asian and African Studies,* 46, no. 6 (2011): 650-662.
Du Bois, Duncan. "The 'coolie curse': The evolution of white colonial attitudes towards the Indian question, 1860-1900." *Historia*, 57, no. 2 (September 2012): 31-67.
Dua, Enakshi. "Racialising Imperial Canada: Indian women and the making of ethnic communities." In *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernities*, edited by Antoinette Burton. London: Routledge, 1999.
Fischer-Tine, Harald. *Low and Licentious Europeans: Race, Class, and 'White Subalternity' in Colonial India*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan Pvt Ltd, 2009.
Frankel, Oz. "Blue Books and the Victorian Reader." *Victorian Studies* (Winter 2004): 308-318.
Frost, Mark Ravinder. "Asia's Maritime Networks and the Colonial Public Sphere, 1840-1920." *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 6, no. 2 (December 2004): 63-94.
---. "In Search of Cosmopolitan Discourse: A Historical Journey across the Indian Ocean from Singapore to South Africa, 1870-1920." In *Eyes Across the Water: Navigating the Indian Ocean*, edited by Pamila Gupta, Isabel Hofmeyr, and Michael Pearson. Pretoria: Unisa Press, 2010.
---. "'That Great Ocean of Idealism': Calcutta, the Tagore Circle, and the Idea of Asia, 1900-1920." In *Indian Ocean Studies: Cultural, Social, and Political Perspectives*, edited by Shanti Moorthy and Ashraf Jamal. New York: Routledge, 2010.
Gandhi, Leela. *Affective Communities: Anticolonial Thought, Fin-de-Siècle Radicalism, and the Politics of Friendship*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
Gikandi, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
Gorman, Daniel. "Wider and Wider Still?: Racial Politics, Intra-Imperial Immigration and the Absence of an Imperial Citizenship in the British Empire." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 30, no. 3 (Winter 2002): 1-24.
---. *Imperial Citizenship: Empire and the Question of Belonging*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006.
Gould, Harold A. *Sikhs, Swamis, Students, and Spies: The India Lobby in the United States, 1900-1946.* New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2006.
Gregory, Robert. *India and East Africa: A History of Race Relations within the British Empire, 1890-1939*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
Guha, Ramachandra. *Gandhi Before India*. New York: Vintage Books, 2015.

Hall, Catherine. *Civilising Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2002.
---. "The Nation Without and Within." In *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender, and the British Reform Act of 1867*, edited by Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland, and Jane Rendall. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Hans, Raj Kumar. "Punjabi Press and Immigrant Culture in British Columbia between Wars." *Economic and Political Weekly* 33, no. 16 (April 1998): 885-888.
Harrison, Mark. *Climates and Constitutions: Health, Race, Environment and British Imperialism in India, 1600-1850*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999.
Headrick, Daniel. "A Double-Edged Sword: Communications and Imperial Control in British India," *Historical Social Research* 35, no. 1 (2010): 51-65.
Hellman-Rajanayagam, Dagmar. "Is there a Tamil 'race'?" In *The Concept of Race in South Asia*, edited by Peter Robb. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995.
Hiralal, Kalpana. "'Our plucky sisters who have dared to fight': Indian Women and the Satyagraha movement in South Africa." *The Oriental Anthropologist* 9, no. 1 (2009): 1-22.
---. "Rethinking Gender and Agency in the Satyagraha Movement of 1913." *Journal of Social Sciences* 25 (2010): 71-80.
Ho, Enseng. "Empire Through Diasporic Eyes: A View from the Other Boat." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 46, no. 2 (2004): 210-246.
Hofmeyr, Isabel. "Indian Ocean Lives and Letters." *English in Africa* 35, no. 1 (May 2008): 11-25.
---. "Violent Texts, Vulnerable Readers: *Hind Swaraj* and its South African Audiences," *Public Culture* 23, no. 2 (2011): 285-297.
---. *Gandhi's Printing Press: Experiments in Slow Reading*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013.
Hofmeyr, Isabel and Michelle Williams. "South Africa–India: Historical Connections, Cultural Circulations and Socio-political Comparisons." In *South Africa and India: Shaping the Global South,* edited by Isabel Hofmeyr and Michelle Williams. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2011.
Hofmeyr, Isabel, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen. "Introduction: Print Cultures, Nationalisms and Publics of the Indian Ocean." *Africa: Special Issue on Print Cultures, Nationalisms, and Publics of the Indian Ocean*, edited by Isabel Hofmeyr, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen, 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 1-22.
Hotta, Eri. "Rash Behari Bose and His Japanese Supporters: An Insight into Anti-Colonial Nationalism and Pan Asianism." *Interventions* 8, no. 1 (2006): 116-32.
Hunt, James. *Gandhi in London*, revised edition. New Delhi: Promilla & Co. Publishers, 1978, 1993.
Huttenback, Robert A. *Gandhi in South Africa: British Imperialism and the Indian Question, 1860-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1971.
---. "The British Empire as a 'White Man's Country'—Racial Attitudes and Immigration Legislation in the Colonies of White Settlement." *The Journal of British Studies* 13, no. 1 (November 1973): 108-137.
---. *Racism and Empire: White Settlers and Coloured Immigrants in the British Self-governing Colonies, 1830-1910.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976.

Hyslop, Jonathan. “The Imperial Working Class Makes Itself 'White': White Labourism in Britain, Australia and South Africa Before the First World War." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 12, no. 4 (December 1999): 398-421.
---. “An ‘Eventful’ History of *Hind Swaraj*: Gandhi between the Battle of Tsushima and the Union of South Africa.” *Public Culture* 23, no. 2 (2011): 299-319.
Ignatiev, Noel. *How the Irish Became White.* London: Routledge, 1995.
Inness, C. L. *A History of Black and Asian Writing in Britain*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 2008.
Israel, Milton. *Communications and Power: Propaganda and Press in the Indian Nationalist Struggle, 1920-1947*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Colour: European immigrants and the alchemy of race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
Jeppie, Shamil. “Re-classifications: Coloured, Malay, Muslim,” in *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place: New Perspectives on Coloured Identities in Cape Town*, edited by Zimitri Erasmus. Colorado Springs: International Academic Publishers Ltd., 2001.
Johnston, Hugh. *The East Indians in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1984.
---. *The Voyage of the* Komagata Maru*: The Sikh Challenge to Canada’s Colour Bar, Expanded and Fully Revised Edition*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1989, 2014.
Jones, Cecily. *Engendering Whiteness: White Women and Colonialism in Barbados and North Carolina, 1627-1865*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.
Kalpagam, U. “Colonial Governmentality and the Public Sphere in India.” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 15, no. 1 (March 2002), 35-58.
Karatani, Reiko. *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003.
Kaul, Chandrika. *Reporting the Raj: The British Press and India, c. 1880-1922.* Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2003.
Kondapi, C. *Indians Overseas, 1838-1949*. New Delhi: Indian Council of World Affairs, 1951.
Koshy, Susan. “South Asians and the Complex Interstices of Whiteness: Negotiating Public Sentiment in the United States and Britain.” In *White Women in Racialized Spaces: Imaginative Transformation and Ethical Action in Literature*, ed. Samina Najmi and Rajini Srikanth. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
Koshy, Susan and R. Radhakrishnan, eds. *Transnational South Asians: The Making of a Neo-Diaspora*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Kosmin, Barry A. “London’s Asian M.P.s: The Contrasting Careers of Three Parsee Politicians.” *Indo-British Review: A Journal of History* 16, no. 2 (June 1989): 27-38.
Lake, Marilyn. “From Mississippi to Melbourne via Natal: The Invention of the Literacy Test as a Technology of Racial Exclusion.” In *Connected Worlds: History in Transnational Perspective*, edited by Ann Curthoys and Marilyn Lake. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2006.
Lake, Marilyn and Henry Reynolds. *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men’s Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
Lawrence, Bonita and Enakshi Dua. “Decolonizing Antiracism.” *Social Justice* 32, no. 4 (2005): 120-143.
Lindeborg, Ruth. “The ‘Asiatic’ and the Boundaries of Victorian Englishness." *Victorian Studies* 37 (Spring 1994): 381-404.

Majeed, Javed. *Autobiography, Travel and Postnational Identity: Gandhi, Nehru and Iqbal*. Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007.
Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
Markovits, Claude. *Global World of Indian Merchants, 1750-1947: Traders of Sind from Bukhara to Panama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
Marriott, John. *The Other Empire: Metropolis, India, and Progress in the Colonial Imagination.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.
Martens, Jeremy. "A Transnational History of Immigration Restriction: Natal and New South Wales, 1896-7." *Journal of Imperial and Colonial History* 34, no. 3 (September 2006): 323-44.
Mawani, Renisa. "Specters of Indigeneity in British Indian Migration." *Law and Society Review* 46, no. 2 (June 2012): 369-403.
McClain, Charles J. "Tortuous Path, Elusive Goal: The Asian Quest for American Citizenship." *Asian Law Journal* 33 (1995): 33-61.
McClelland, Keith and Sonya O. Rose. "Citizenship and empire, 1867–1928." In *At Home with the Empire*, edited by Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
McKeown, Adam. *Melancholy Order: Asian Migration and the Globalization of Borders*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
McLaughlin, Joseph. *Writing the Urban Jungle: Reading Empire in London from Doyle to Eliot*. University of Virginia Press, 2000.
Mehta, Uday Singh. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth Century British Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
Mesthrie, Uma Shashikant. "From Advocacy to Mobilization: *Indian Opinion*, 1903-1914." In *South African's Alternative Press: Voices of Protest and Resistance, 1800s-1960s*, edited byLes Switzer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Metcalf, Thomas R. *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena 1860-1920*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
Molina, Natalia. "Constructing Mexicans as Deportable Immigrants: Race, Disease, and the Meaning of 'Public Charge.'" *Identities* 17, no. 6 (2010): 641-666.
Mongia, Radhika Viya. "Race, Nationality, Mobility: A History of the Passport." In *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation*, edited by Antoinette Burton. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.
---. "Gender and the Historiography of Gandhian *Satyagraha* in South Africa." *Gender and History* 18, no. 1 (April 2006): 130-149.
Mukherjee, Sumita. *Nationalism, Education and Migrant Identities: The England-returned*. London: Routledge, 2010.
Mohanram, Radhika. *Imperial White: Race, Diaspora, and the British Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
Mizutani, Satoshi. *The Meaning of White: Race, Class, and the 'Domiciled Community' in British India 1858-1930.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Mukherjee, Sumita and Rehana Ahmed, eds. *South Asian Resistances in Britain 1858-1947*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2012.
Muthanna, I.M. *People of India in North America*. Bangalore: Lotus Printers, 1975.

Nair, Savita. "Shops and Stations: Rethinking Power and Privilege in British/Indian East Africa." In *India in Africa, Africa in India: Indian Ocean Cosmopolitanisms*, edited by John C. Hawley. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Nalbach, Alex. "'The Software of Empire': Telegraphic News Agencies and Imperial Publicity, 1865-1914." *Imperial Co-Histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press*, edited by Julie Codell. New Jersey: Associated University Presses, 2003.

Newman, Brooke. "Gender, Sexuality, and the Formation of Racial Identities in the 18th Century Anglo-Caribbean World." *Gender & History* 22, no. 3 (November 2010): 1-18.

Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Pachai, B. "The History of "Indian Opinion", 1903-14." In *Archives Yearbook for South African History*. Cape Town: Cape & Transvaal Printers Ltd., 1963.

---. *The International Aspects of the South African Indian Question 1860-1971*. Cape Town: C. Struik (Pty) Ltd., 1971.

Parameswaran, Radhika and Kavitha Cardoza. *Melanin on the margins: advertising and the cultural politics of fair/light/white beauty in India.* Columbia, South Carolina: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 2009.

Perry, Adele. *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001. Philips, Amali. "Gendering Colour: Identity, Femininity, and Marriage in Kerala." *Anthropologica* 46, no. 2 (2004): 253-272.

Potter, Simon J. *News and the British World: The Emergence of an Imperial Press System, 1876-1922*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Raghuram, Parvati and Ajaya Kumar Sahoo. "Thinking 'Indian Diaspora' for Our Times." In *Tracing an Indian Diaspora: contexts, memoires, representations*, edited by Parvati Raghuram, Ajaya Kumar Sahoo, Brij Maharaj, and Dave Sangha. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008.

Rai, Rajesh and Peter Reeves. "Introduction." In *The South Asian Diaspora: Transnational networks and changing identities*, edited by Rajesh Rai and Peter Reeves. London: Routledge, 2009.

Ramnath, Maia. *Haj to Utopia: How the Ghadr Movement Charted Global Radicalism and Attempted to Overthrow the British Empire*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, Ltd., 2011.

Reed, Charles V. "Respectable Subjects of the Queen: The Royal Tour of 1901 and Imperial Citizenship in South Africa." In *Britishness, Identity and Citizenship: The View from Abroad*, edited by Catherine McGlynn, Andrew Mycock and James W. McAuley. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011.

Richard, Eves. "Unsettling settler colonialism: Debates over climate and colonization in New Guinea, 1875-1914." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 28, no. 2 (March 2005): 304-330.

Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. London: Verso, 1991, 2007.

---. "Introduction." In *Black on White: Black writers on what it means to be White*, edited by David R. Roediger. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1998.

Rush, Anne Spry and Charles V. Reed. "Imperial Citizenship in a British World." In *Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies*, edited by Engin F. Isin and Peter Nyers. London: Routledge, 2014.

Rushdie, Salman. "The New Empire Within Britain." In *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta Books, 1991.
Saranillo, Dean Itsuji. "Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and indigenous difference." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3-4 (2013): 280-294.
Satia, Priya. "Developing Iraq: Britain, India and the Redemption of Empire and Technology in the First World War." *Past and Present* 197, no. 1 (2007): 211-255.
Shah, Nayan. *Stranger Intimacy: Contesting Race, Sexuality, and the Law in the North American West*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 2011.
Sharma, Nandita and Cynthia Wright. "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States." *Social Justice* 35, no. 3 (2008-2009): 120-138.
Sharma, Meenakshi. "The Empire of English and its Legacy: A Citizenship of the mind." *Britishness, Identity and Citizenship: The View from Abroad*, edited by Catherine McGlynn, Andrew Mycock and James W. McAuley. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2011.
Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1993.
Silvestri, Michael. "The Bomb, *Bhadralok*, *Bhagavad Gita*, and Dan Breen: Terrorism in Bengal and its Relation to the European Experience." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 21, no. 1 (2009): 1-27.
Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
---. "The Strange Death of an Imperial Ideal: The Case of *Civis Britannicus*." In *Modern Makeovers: Handbook of Modernity in South Asia*, edited by Saurabh Dube. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Sohi, Seema. "Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anticolonialism in the Transnational Western U.S.-Canadian Borderlands." *Journal of American History* 98, no. 2 (September 2011): 420-436.
---. "Repressing the 'Hindu Menace,': Race, Anarchy, and Indian Anticolonialism." In *The Sun Never Sets: South Asian Migrants in an Age of U. S. Power*, edited by Vivek Bald, Miabi Chatterjee, Sujani Reddy, and Manu Vimalassery. New York: New York University, 2013.
---. *Echoes of Mutiny: Race, Surveillance, and Indian Anticolonialism in North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Spector-Marks, Irina. "The Indians' Own Magna Carta Britishness and Imperial Citizenship in Diasporic Print Culture, 1900-1914." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 16, no. 3 (December 2015).
---. "(Mis)Representing the *Komagata Maru* in Indian Print Cultures," in *Charting Imperial Itineraries: Unmooring the* Komagata Maru, edited by Satwinder Kaur Bains, Davina Bhandar, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Renisa Mawani. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, forthcoming.
Srinivasan, R. "G. A. Natesan (1873-1949): Nationalist Publisher in a Colonial Context." *Indica* 38, nos. 1 and 2 (2001): 293-200.
Swan, Maureen. *Gandhi: The South African Experience*. Johannesburg: Raven Press (Pty) Ltd, 1985.

Tambe, Ashwini. "Hierarchies of subalternity: Managed stratification in Bombay's brothels, 1914-1930." In *The Limits of Colonial Control in South Asia: Spaces of Disorder in the Indian Ocean Region*, edited by Ashwini Tambe and Harald Fischer-Tiné. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Tehranian, John. "Performing Whiteness: Naturalization Litigation and the Contstruction of Racial Identity in America." *The Yale Law Journal* Vol. 109, No. 4 (January 2000): 817-848.

Tinker, Hugh. *Separate and Unequal: India and the Indians in the British Commonwealth 1920-1950*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1976.

Trautmann, Thomas R. *Aryans and British India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Tsing, Anna. *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Vahed, Goolam. "Constructions of Community and Identity among Indians in Colonial Natal, 1860-1910: The Role of the Muharram Festival." *The Journal of African History* 43, no. 1 (2002): 77-93.

---. "Passengers, Partnerships, and Promissory Notes: Gujarati Traders in Colonial Natal, 1870-1920." *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 38, no. 3 (2005): 449-479.

van der Veer, Peter. "Introduction." In *Nation and Migration: The Politics of Space in the South Asian Diaspora*, edited by Peter van der Veer. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

---. "Currying Favor: The Politics of British Educational and Cultural Policy in India, 1813-1854." In *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, edited by Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

Vrudhula, Rajiv M. *The Bengalee babu: Ideology, stereotype and the quest for authenticity in colonial South Asian literature*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1999. http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/docview/304541611/fulltextPDF/B82441F944EA4C8DPQ/1?accountid=14553.

Waetjen, Thembisa and Goolam Vahed. "The Diaspora at Home: *Indian Views* and the Making of Zuleikha Mayat's Public Voice." *Africa: Special Issue on Print Cultures, Nationalisms, and Publics of the Indian Ocean*, edited by Isabel Hofmeyr, Preben Kaarsholm, and Bodil Folke Frederiksen 81, no. 1 (February 2011): 23-41.

Wemyss, Georgie. *The Invisible Empire: White Discourse, Tolerance, and Belonging*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Wilson, Kathleen. *The Island Race: Englishness, Empire, and Gender in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Wohl, Anthony S. "'Dizzi ben Dizzi': Disraeli as Alien." *Journal of British Studies* 34, no. 3 (July 1995): 375-411.

Yarwood, A. T. "The Overseas Indian as a Problem in Indian and Imperial Politics at the End of World War One." *The Australian Journal of Politics and History* 14, no. 2 (August 1968): 204-218.